

A

0006310239



UC SOUTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY FACILITY

SRLF

UCI

California
onal
ity







Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2007 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

HANDBOOK FOR SPEAKERS.

D
643

A7

L3

1919

SRLF

LABOUR

AND

THE PEACE TREATY.

**An Examination of Labour
Declarations**

and

The Treaty Terms.

(Great Britain)

THE LABOUR PARTY, 33, Eccleston Square, London, S.W. 1.

CONTENTS.

PART I.

LABOUR'S COMMITMENT TO CERTAIN PRINCIPLES OF SETTLEMENT.

- I. Labour's Pledges : " Revision for Honour and Expediency."
- II. " Open Covenants " and the making of the Treaty : the Old Diplomacy revived.
- III. Labour's Objects at the Peace.

PART II.

THE TREATY CLAUSES AND LABOUR'S DECLARATIONS : A SERIATIM COMPARISON.

- I. The League of Nations : Note on Representation.
- II. Responsibility and Punishment.
- III. Reparation and Restitution : Economic Clauses.
- IV. The Boundaries of Germany and German Austria.
- V. Colonies.
- VI. China.
- VII. Naval and Military : Disarmament : Guarantees.

PART III.

RUSSIA : THE TREATY AND INDUSTRIAL DEMOCRACY IN EUROPE.

PART IV.

SUMMARISATION : POINTS UPON WHICH REVISION IS MOST NEEDED.

PART V.

DOCUMENTS.

- I. German Counter Proposals and Objections (Count Rantzau's Statement).
- II. Manifestoes by General Smuts.
- III. Protest of Mr. Bullitt, American Commissioner.
- IV. A Belgian Protest.
- V. Protest of British University Men.
- VI. President Wilson's Fourteen Points and Five Points.
- VII. Allied Memorandum to German Government of Nov. 5, 1918.

PART I.

LABOUR'S COMMITMENT TO CERTAIN PRINCIPLES OF SETTLEMENT.

CHAPTER I.

LABOUR'S PLEDGES: "REVISION FOR HONOUR AND EXPEDIENCY."

Labour's repeated pledges to revise the Treaty. Why the future of European Democracy depends on the fulfilment of these pledges. Labour's Declarations.

pp. 5-8

CHAPTER II.

"OPEN COVENANTS" AND THE MAKING OF THE TREATY: THE OLD DIPLOMACY REVIVED.

The abandonment of Open Covenants at the Conference; the trail of the Secret Treaties and reversion to the Balance of Power. Why commitments under the New Triple Alliance will be in conflict with the obligations of impartiality under the League of Nations. An American view of the Triple Alliance.

pp. 8-12

CHAPTER III.

LABOUR'S OBJECTS AT THE PEACE.

Summary of principles enunciated by Labour and the respects in which the Treaty is in violation of them. Labour and President Wilson.

pp. 12-20

PART II.

THE TREATY CLAUSES AND LABOUR'S DECLARATIONS: A SERIATIM COMPARISON.

CHAPTER I.

THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS: NOTE ON REPRESENTATION.

Labour has always sought in the League of Nations, not so much an alliance of governments for coercion as a parliament of peoples for altering the conditions which, unaltered, would lead to war: why the Covenant fails as such an instrument and some of the changes which are necessary.

pp. 21-28

CHAPTER II.

RESPONSIBILITY AND PUNISHMENT.

The treaty is in flagrant violation of the principles enunciated not only by Labour, but by President Wilson.

pp. 28-30

CHAPTER III.

REPARATION AND RESTITUTION: ECONOMIC CLAUSES.

Labour for restitution, but against economic imperialism and war after the war. How "selfish economic combinations" create war. A warning as to "Preference." The need for international control of raw material if there is to

be equality of economic opportunity. Why Labour is interested in preventing famine conditions in Germany. pp. 31-41

CHAPTER IV.

THE BOUNDARIES OF GERMANY AND GERMAN AUSTRIA.

In what respects the changes of frontier violate the principle of nationality and the right of all peoples to means of subsistence. The unsatisfactory nature of the plebiscites. The violation of the rights of German Austrians. pp. 41-45

CHAPTER V.

COLONIES.

The failure of the Treaty to make provision against the colonial question becoming the cause of further wars in the economic conflicts for raw materials. The inadequacy of the mandatory system. pp. 46-48

CHAPTER VI.

CHINA.

Japanese imperialism in China and the protests of the Chinese Delegates. pp. 48-50

CHAPTER VII.

NAVAL AND MILITARY DISARMAMENT: GUARANTEES.

The disarmament clauses of the Treaty entirely one-sided: no general disarmament. The significance of the Rhineland Republic movement. What a fifteen years' occupation may involve. Militarist activity among the Allies. pp. 50-55

PART III.

RUSSIA: THE TREATY AND INDUSTRIAL DEMOCRACY IN EUROPE.

Why the Russian situation cannot be dissociated from the Treaty. Reasons for Labour's emphatic stand on Russian policy: the key to the future of industrial democracy throughout the world. Labour standing not for Bolshevism, but against reaction. pp. 55-64

PART IV.

SUMMARISATION.

Points upon which revision is most needed. pp. 64-67

PART V.

DOCUMENTS.

pp. 68-87

NOTE.

All resolutions and manifestos of Labour organisations are printed in italics.

Labour

AND

The Peace Treaty.

PART I.

LABOUR'S COMMITMENT TO CERTAIN PRINCIPLES OF SETTLEMENT.

CHAPTER I.

LABOUR'S PLEDGES. "REVISION FOR HONOUR AND EXPEDIENCY."

Labour's repeated pledges to revise the Treaty. Why the future of European Democracy depends on the fulfilment of these pledges. Labour's Declarations.

The British Labour Party, as well as the Parliamentary Committee of the Trades Union Congress, have on several occasions, and through several channels, since the outbreak of the War⁽¹⁾ insisted clearly and emphatically, not alone on certain general principles of settlement, but on certain specific details as well.

These declarations, formal, specific, and unmistakable, definitely commit organised Labour in England to a certain policy with reference to the Peace. If we could imagine British Labour not living up to its professions in this respect, but making a scrap of paper of them, not only would the re-establishment of confidence among the workers of the world become impossible, but such efforts as are being made by some at least of the German workers to create a truly democratic and non-military republic would be frustrated. British Labour would have strengthened the forces of nationalism and militarism in Germany, perhaps have delivered German workers and Socialists over to those forces.⁽²⁾

The militarist parties in Germany have always justified both their violation of treaty obligations and their demand for overwhelming

(1) Inter-Allied Labour and Socialist Conference, February, 1915; Labour Party Annual Conference, Bristol, 1916; National Conference of Trades Union Congress and Labour Party, 1917; Inter-Allied Labour and Socialist Conference, London, February, 1918; Idem, September, 1918; Trades Union Congress and Labour Party Conference on League of Nations, April, 1919; International Labour and Socialist Conference, Berne, 1919; Committee of Action Idem, Paris, 1919; Permanent Committee, Idem, Amsterdam, 1919; National Executive, Labour Party, London, May 8, 1919; Joint Meeting National Executive and Parliamentary Labour Party, June 4, 1919; Labour Party Annual Conference, Southport, 1919.

(2) "Does the Labour Party realise that if it allows a Peace of violence to be signed, it disarms German Socialists in face of those Pan-German schemes?"—H. N. Brailsford, writing from Berlin.

armament on the ground that the rights of Germany would not be respected nor her due opportunities ensured unless she were in a position to compel those things by force. If now, at the moment that the new German Republic has destroyed the old royal dynasties and is weak and unable to resist, the Western democracies throw over in their moment of victory and power all the high principles which they proclaimed when they were not yet victorious, the German militarists will point to that fact as proof of the truth of their prediction that promises of justice and fair treatment would melt as soon as Germany became demilitarised.

Whether government by the workers is to succeed, in Germany, Hungary, Russia, and elsewhere, will depend upon the fidelity of Labour in the Entente countries to principles which it has so repeatedly professed in the past.

The commitments of Labour to revision of the Treaty have steadily grown in definiteness and emphasis during the last four years. Not only is Labour committed to revision by the fact that the Treaties, both with Germany and Austria, are in plain violation of the principles it has so often expressed during the War, but it is committed also by repeated declarations, made since the terms of the Treaty and of the Covenant of the League of Nations (embodied in it) became known.

The Annual Conference of the Labour Party at Southport, 1919, voted the following resolution:—

"The Conference is of opinion, now that Germany has decided to sign the Treaty of Peace, thereby opening up the opportunity of co-operation with the democracies of the world, that its speedy admission to the League of Nations and the immediate revision by the League of Nations of the harsh provisions of the Treaty, which are inconsistent with the statements made on behalf of the Allied Governments when the Armistice was made, are essential both on grounds of honour and expediency; and it therefore calls upon the Labour movement, in conjunction with the International, to undertake a vigorous campaign for the winning of popular support to this policy as a first step towards the reconciliation of the peoples and the inauguration of a new era of international co-operation and good will."

At a joint meeting of the National Executive Labour Party and the Parliamentary Labour Party on June 4, at the House of Commons, the following manifesto was voted unanimously:—

The Parliamentary Labour Party and the National Executive, having considered the preliminary peace proposals, declares that the Treaty is defective not so much because of this or that detail of wrong done but fundamentally in that it accepts and, indeed, is based upon the very political principles which were the ultimate cause of the war. The Treaty involves a violation of the principles embodied in Labour and Socialist Conference decisions. It also violates the understanding upon which the armistice was signed, and is, therefore, a repudiation of the spirit and letter of the declarations of President Wilson, Mr. Lloyd George, and other Allied statesmen.

"Organised Labour throughout the war resolutely opposed all attempts to transform the struggle for the emancipation of peoples into a war of conquest. . . . The peoples want peace, and demand that peace shall be lasting. We therefore call upon the organised workers of all countries to join in an effort to bring the Treaty more into harmony with the working-class conception of an enduring and democratic settlement. Only when the menace of further war, which this Treaty does not remove, is lifted from the world can the burdened peoples obtain release from conscription and begin the work of raising the international standard of life and labour and the inauguration of a new social order."

About a month previously (May 8) the National Executive of the Labour Party had issued a Manifesto, of which the following is the opening paragraph :—

"Throughout the war British Labour and National and Inter-Allied Labour Socialist Conferences formulated their war aims and consistently opposed any settlement of the European struggle calculated to prepare fresh conflicts, create new grievances and subject various peoples to the double plague of armaments and war. In the spirit of these declarations, the organised workers supported the proposals of President Wilson, as expressed in the fourteen points and his subsequent addresses, which later became the basis of the Armistice. The National Executive of the Labour Party considers that the published summary of the Peace Treaty in some essential particulars is opposed to the declarations of President Wilson, the Inter-Allied Conferences, and the Berne Conference, is very defective from the standpoint of world peace, and bears evidence of compromise influenced by capitalist imperialism, which still dominates the European States."

French, Belgian, and Italian Labour organisations have voiced condemnation of the Treaty even more severe than that just quoted.

French Declaration.

The National Committee of the French General Confederation of Labour adopted unanimously on May 27 the following resolution :—

"The National Committee is of opinion that the diplomatic instrument born of the Peace Conference in no way corresponds to the aspirations expressed by the belligerent nations and by all the nations;

That the treaty carries on the transactions born of secret diplomacy, which is now indefensible;

That, far from establishing a new world regime which would render impossible any recurrence of war, it is permitting the continuance of germs of conflict similar to those which brought this great catastrophe upon humanity.

Such texts will never realise the just and permanent Peace which is desired by the workers of the whole world.

The Peace Treaty will entail a situation aggravated by territorial rivalries, growing hatred, desire for revenge, the impossibility of economic reconstitution, national and international lack of equilibrium.

For all these reasons, being of opinion that principles have been affirmed during this war which the treaty ignores, that promises have been made which are being set aside, that none of the hopes cherished by the peoples have been realised.

In face of the powerlessness or bad will of the governments to produce equitable and humane proposals, the Committee declares that Labour must take action to redress this peace in order to realise the true peace of the peoples and a stable world organisation which will guarantee peace and secure the resumption of economic life, which is its principal condition.

True to the principles of liberty of peace and of justice which guide it, the working classes of this country will resolutely apply themselves to the realisation of this necessary task, both by national action and by uniting their efforts to those of the workers of other countries.

Italian Declaration.

The Resolution of the Italian Socialist Parliamentary Group (voted unanimously by forty-one deputies) is even more vigorous. It states the Italian Parliamentary Socialist Group :—

Considers that the agreement of surrender of the defeated nations was expressly based on the fourteen points proclaimed by the President of the United States and on the points added thereto, and that the draft of the treaty, both as a whole, and in each clause, is in flagrant contradiction to these same points, and therefore constitute the most shameful breach of agreement known in the history of conquerors.

Considers that the treaty in its very essence violently crushes the conquered with the whole weight of the military and economic superiority of the victors, and that it can only be operative so long as the idea of their own powerlessness and incapacity to find allies and stir up enemies against their oppressors persists among the conquered peoples, shaken by anger and a desire for bloody revenge, and

consequently, so long as they are resigned to being the slaves of the victors, obliged to serve them alone, to work for them alone, with a mutilated national territory, a divided population, without Colonies, without raw materials, without means of transport, and even without free disposition of their own internal routes of navigation.

Considers that the disarmament imposed upon the conquered peoples without the substitution of any guarantee, not even that of being able to enter the League of Nations, places them in a position of absolute dependence on their conquerors and leaves them exposed to the abuses, to which the victors will be incited by the mere conviction that they can attempt them without risk, thus creating great and constant unrest in international conditions and continual danger of war.

Considers that the treaty multiplies the number of States, nominally free, but in reality vassals of the Entente by assigning to them frontiers which do not correspond to the object and true historical and territorial *raison d'être* of the peoples, but only to the victors' opportunity to divide, disperse and imprison the defeated nations, without considering in the very least that, through these artificial and unnatural State combinations there are new tyrannies and multiplying causes of friction, and consequently the danger of war on the part of the nations to whose aspirations violence is being done.

Resolves :—

To oppose the ratification of the treaty by Parliament, by all means in its power.

To make every effort to have it submitted in its entirety to the judgment of the people at the next election.

Resolves further :—

To communicate this Resolution to all the Socialist groups in the Parliaments of Europe. And while congratulating itself on the strong attitude of protest taken by the Socialist group in the French Parliament, and by many political and economic organisations of the International working classes, expresses the earnest hope that, under the auspices of the executives of the different Socialist Parties, the representatives of Parliamentary Socialism will unite in a joint action of protest and condemnation of the Treaty, and in every case lay down the basis of its radical revision, before it has produced its natural homicidal and liberty-destroying effects, by overthrowing the governments responsible for it, and by rebuilding society on the recognised principles of liberty and justice of International socialism.

CHAPTER II.

“ OPEN COVENANTS ” AND THE MAKING OF THE TREATY. THE OLD DIPLOMACY REVIVED.

The abandonment of Open Covenants at the Conference; the trail of the Secret Treaties and reversion to the Balance of Power. Why commitments under the New Triple Alliance will be in conflict with the obligations of impartiality under the League of Nations. An American view of the Triple Alliance.

Labour has always placed in the forefront of its demands concerning the Peace the condition which President Wilson makes the first of his Fourteen Points :—

“ Open covenants of peace, openly arrived at, after which there shall be no private international understandings of any kind, but diplomacy shall proceed always frankly and in the public view.”

The Annual Conference of the Party at Bristol, 1916, passed a resolution which included the following :—

“ On the conclusion of the War the working classes of all industrial countries must unite in the International in order to suppress secret diplomacy.”

The Memorandum on War Aims confirmed this as follows :—

"The suppression of secret diplomacy, to be replaced by the conduct of foreign policy under the control of popular legislatures, and the publication of all treaties, which must never be in contravention of the stipulations of the League of Nations."

This vital pre-requisite of democracy has been utterly disregarded in the making of the Peace,⁽¹⁾ with the inevitable result of vitiating its whole character, rendering the League of Nations but a thin disguise for the re-establishment of the old diplomacy on the basis of the Balance of Power, which, Mr. Wilson had declared, was now "for ever discredited."

It is important to see how this has come about.

Although at the time that the Conference assembled it was known that there existed Secret Treaties which had poisoned the whole course of Allied diplomacy during the War, only the briefest hint was made for publicity of discussion. Almost immediately the real decisions of the Conference were taken out of the hands of the delegates as a whole and made first by an inner council—the Big Ten—then by 'a still smaller council of the Big Four, and finally by the "Big Three." These decisions were made in secret, the reasons for them generally remained secret, and often, as in the case of the Russian matters, the decisions themselves. The diplomacy of the Conference of Paris became even more secret than had been that of the Conference of Vienna.

At the time of President Wilson's arrival in Europe M. Clemenceau stated very frankly in the Chamber of Deputies what his attitude towards Mr. Wilson's principles would be. M. Clemenceau said that he was sceptical as to the League of Nations, and adhered to the old system of the balances of power and the old system of alliances; in his view France's best security lay therein. He announced beforehand very frankly that "this system of alliances would be his guiding thought at the Conference."

Towards the close of the Conference there was announced the formation of a new Triple Alliance, that of France, Britain, and America. Its object is the re-ensurance of France against German aggression, in case the reduction of the German army to one hundred thousand men and the occupation of the Left Bank of the Rhine, etc., should not suffice.

Did history contain no warnings as to the misuse of this kind of instrument by militarist parties in the past, British Labour would welcome the arrangement, perhaps without reservation, although it implies scepticism as to the efficacy of the League of Nations. British Labour certainly desires the completest protection of Republican France in the future from the agonies of invasion. But the choice between the old and new method in international affairs may be involved in the policy of the new Alliance, and certain relevant facts should be considered.

The first is that if Germany sets about the revival of her military power she will turn her attention first, not to the Left Bank of the

(1) Even the *Times*, which resents Labour criticism of the Treaty's violations of the Fourteen Points as implying that "the Labour Party know their meaning better than Mr. Wilson does," admits the violation of this point. "These piecemeal and imperfect disclosures are really more likely to confuse the public than to enlighten them. They stand in curious contrast to the premise of open covenants and open diplomatic processes made by Mr. Wilson when he traced beforehand the new path on which the world was to enter under democratic auspices."—Leading article, May 26.

Rhine, but to Poland and the Border States. For if Germany can undermine the barrier which separates her from Russia there is the chance of a Russo-German combination which might offer some prospect of the resurrection of German power; not otherwise. So long as an anti-German Poland, capable of putting a million men into the field, remains, any effective combination of German and Russian forces can be prevented. That is why France has such predominating influence today in the politics and military organisation of all the new Border States. Poland is for France the succession of Russia in Alliance arrangements.

Imagine a quarrel between Poland and Germany—almost inevitable if past history is any guide—in view of the large “unredeemed” German populations which Poland will include. France, being the Ally of Poland, will be involved; and in any case, depending, as she would under M. Clemenceau’s “system of alliances,” upon the Polish offset to German power, would have to side with Poland whatever the merits of the quarrel. She could not afford to see Poland beaten by German arms. If France became involved, could we remain neutral, whatever the merits of the original German-Polish quarrel? It is likely that we should have to interpret “aggression” very broadly⁽¹⁾.

The situation would mean the re-creation of the whole system of the Balance of Power. Our obligation to support the Franco-Polish “Balance” would render the impartiality of our influence within the League of Nations extremely difficult. It would, for instance, be difficult to consider impartially appeals made by minorities within the Polish State—whether Ukrainian, Ruthenian, German, or Jew—if the Polish Government were an ally of our Ally.

President Wilson has always in his speeches insisted that the Balance of Power would necessarily be in conflict with any general obligation to uphold a system of law, resting on what he has termed the Community of Power. If we are mainly concerned to ensure the solidarity of the new alliance, impartiality in the enforcement of the general rules laid down by the League of Nations will be difficult.

These are not far-fetched speculations. The dilemma here indicated has already presented itself in the attempt to restrain some of the 23 wars which we are now told are raging in Europe. The Conference set certain frontiers for Poles, Ukrainians, Czecho-Slovaks, Hungarians, Roumanians. Yet when these frontiers are crossed by their own Allies no action is taken for the purpose of restraining them. When, indeed, the Poles were ordered to desist in their war upon Ukrainians, it was the legions of General Haller, which had just been sent from France and

(1) Indeed the Poles already allege an “unprovoked aggression” on the part of Germany, which is not, however, pellucidly clear. Mr. Brailsford—just back from Poland—writes to the “Daily News”: “The Polish General Staff has issued to the Press in Paris an alleged German ‘official dispatch,’ which is said to have been intercepted in Silesia. The dispatch is dated Posen, but is unsigned. It states that while the German Government will oppose the renewal of war in the East officially, it will unofficially support it. This is very strange. The Poles are not in occupation of Silesia. How, then, could they intercept a dispatch there? Again, the Germans officially evacuated Posen many months ago, and the Poles occupy it. How, then could a German ‘official dispatch’ emanate from Posen? Lastly, Hörising, the Socialist blacksmith who is Governor of Upper Silesia, is said in the dispatch to be in favour of war. In public he has expressed himself satisfied with the concession of a plébiscite for Upper Silesia. I suggest, Sir, that the good faith of the Polish General Staff has been abused.”

were, in fact, a French-officered army, that disregarded the orders of Paris and continued to march against the Ukrainians. Much the same thing happened at an earlier date, when Poles and Czechs were fighting in Silesia.

And let this be noted : These developments are no reflection upon the genuineness of the French nation's desire for peace. The British democracy to-day is utterly unable to prevent a war by its Government upon the Russian Soviets, although Labour has most formally and energetically pronounced against it. And French Labour and Socialism will be equally helpless in controlling the intrigues of military and diplomatic cliques so long as the private diplomacy of a few Foreign Offices and the military combinations of two or three General Staffs are the real forces in international affairs and within the League of Nations, and when the League as a whole is proclaimed—as the formation of a special Alliance does proclaim it—as ineffective. If we expect others—Poles, Ukrainians, Czechs, to say nothing of Germans and Austrians—to trust to the League for defence as well as justice, we must show that we ourselves believe in it, and have no special obligations which conflict with impartial justice to all its members.

French Labour opinion is completely at one with the view just expressed. The National Committee of the French General Confederation of Labour voted unanimously (May 27) a protest :—

Against the return to the old system of alliances, grouping country against country, rousing imperialism against imperialism, continuing national and racial antagonisms.

This system, which was one of the chief causes of the world conflict, was condemned by the war, and should have no place in the general code of the League of Nations. To return to it is to disregard the known will of the peoples and to fall back into the same state of things and the same fatal paths in which the world found itself before the European war.

If parts in the foregoing judgment should sound harsh, let the English reader consider the views of an American organ which has in the past been a firm supporter of Mr. Wilson (and, incidentally, particularly sympathetic to the aims of British Labour). The *New Republic* (May 24, 1919) says :—

“ Every entangling alliance, almost without exception, is fervently described in the text as defensive, that there is absolutely no practical distinction between a defensive and an offensive alliance, that from the forging of the Ems dispatch to the murder of the Austrian Archduke intriguing diplomats have never found the slightest difficulty in manufacturing a defensive pretext for an offensive purpose. It is incredible that any American statesman should have forgotten this so completely that after denouncing special alliances time without number he should be so flabbergasted by the word ‘ unprovoked ’ as to miss the whole significance of the project.

“ Examine the plan in this European setting and what does it mean? As a result of the War France is left as the one great military power on the Continent of Europe. Her army has a glorious tradition, the staff is the finest in Europe, her greatest rival is completely and permanently disarmed. Against this rival she is to be reinsured by a covenant which is supposed to apply the force of all its members against any kind of sudden aggression. Then a military frontier is given her, which means that at first hint of aggression by the disarmed Germans the whole left bank of the Rhine can be occupied without resistance by a completely armed France, and on top of this she is to be still further reinsured by a special military alliance with the two Powers who control the seas and the greatest military resources.

"To the French people, terrorised for forty years and invaded for four, this may at the moment seem merely defensive caution. But not to the very astute politicians who manage French foreign policy. They know better. They know that the real meaning of this alliance is to give France a free hand in the mastery of the Continent. By making France absolutely immune to the consequences of any policy she may pursue, she is free to pursue any policy. In exactly this way Bismarck reasoned when he reinsured himself several times over on his eastern and southern front in order to be entirely safe in all his other purposes. Let no one deceive himself about this. The beauty of the French landscape, the charm of Frenchmen, the delicacy of French culture, the hardihood of the French peasant, the democracy of French society have no more to do with the question than did German folk songs and Beethoven's music with the policy of Bismarck or of his more degenerate successors under William II. On the Continent of Europe a nation which is in a privileged position of security is fatally tempted to pursue a policy of intrigue and aggression. That privileged position may be the military power of France absolutely reinsured by special alliance with sea power. Where that privileged position exists the temptation to assert mastery is so intoxicating as to be beyond the power of control. . . .

"The result will be what it has always been. The other nations, far more insecure than France, will infer that if the authors of the Covenant do not trust the League, why in heaven's name should they? Italy is already saying it. Spain looking at her dispute with France in Morocco is bound to say it, and as for Central Europe what other conclusion can she possibly draw? If France needs special protection, the weaker States certainly do, and the next step is to find allies. Now, in the choice of allies as a means of protection, no nation has the slightest scruple. Republican France and Tsarist Russia, England and Japan, Germany and Turkey; it is not principles, but battalions that count.

"The French alliance is bound to call up other alliances within what Mr. Wilson once called 'the common family of the League of Nations,' and, we may add, outside the family. With Germany and Russia outside, and China ready to go, with Italy rather dazzled somewhere in No Man's Land, the number of possible combinations is considerable. All of them, of course, will be purely 'defensive.' The only thing to remember is that these defensive groups will be extraordinarily interested in being loyal to one another. And being loyal to a defensive alliance means—as Mr. Wilson has recently discovered at the cost of his reputation—doing just about what the most determined member of the group insists upon. The result is a set of rival diplomatic groups each arming for its own defensive purposes, and each intriguing for a good start in the next war."

It is worth remembering that the durability of the League will depend largely upon the warmth or coldness of American support.

CHAPTER III.

LABOUR'S OBJECTS AT THE PEACE.

Summary of principles enunciated by Labour and the respects in which the Treaty is in violation of them. Labour and President Wilson.

A summary of the demands of Labour and the underlying reasons of them might be made as follows:—

1. Completely open diplomacy and discussion; particularly where there is involved directly or indirectly economic and political measures which bear on the efforts of the workers to establish a New Social Order throughout the world. Many decisions which are apparently purely political and territorial will, in fact, profoundly affect the fate of Socialist and Labour experiments, not alone in Germany and Hungary, but in Russia, although the last may not be directly involved in the territorial Settlements of the Treaty.

2. The peace must look mainly to the removal of the permanent causes of war with its concomitant oppressions at home and abroad. The greatest of these causes in the past has been the failure of the nations to agree upon and maintain a common law of international life, enabling all to live in security and with equality

of opportunity. The absence of such law set up the desire, on the part of all great States, for (a) preponderant military power as the only dependable means of ensuring the protection of national existence, and (b) territory with raw materials, outlets to sea, etc., as the only sure basis of national prosperity. But in such conditions the security and prosperity of one involved the insecurity and poverty of another. Labour has therefore demanded that any peace-preserving Covenant must include arrangements by which the political security and economic rights of each shall rest upon the combined strength of the whole Society of Nations pledged to arrangements which ensure fair treatment for all, and not upon the mere preponderance of one group over another.

3. This pledge of political security and economic rights must be extended to the enemy States, if plans of disarmament are to proceed. To deprive the enemy States of their means of defence and then permit invasion of their territory, or fiscal and economic measures which take from millions of their populations their means of livelihood, would be a condition that obviously could not endure. The inevitable and increasing resistance, even if only by the evasion of economic undertakings, would necessarily perpetuate the armaments of the Allies.

4. Equality of economic opportunity should be assured to all nations, not alone by the negative policy of removal of economic discrimination and refraining from economic war, but by a constructive policy of international arrangements for the allocation of necessary raw materials according to need. A colonial settlement which will assure absolute equality of access to raw materials and economic opportunity.

5. It is in this policy, permitting to Germany the most rapid recuperation, that will be found the best hope of securing the largest measure of reparation for those who have suffered at her hands.

6. Any international or supernational authority established for the maintenance of Peace should not be a mere alliance of governments for the maintenance of a *status quo*, perhaps unjust and unworkable, or a mere instrument of coercion for ensuring compulsory arbitration on the basis of an old international law, which was itself inequitable, but should be mainly an instrument for changing the conditions likely to lead to war. Its function, that is to say, should not be so much coercive as legislative, operating through popular organs representing the European peoples and parties of all opinions, and not merely the Foreign Offices, Cabinets, or Governments.

7. Labour again and again has emphasised the distinction (also repeatedly made both by Mr. Wilson and Mr. Lloyd George) which must be made between the guilt and responsibilities of the German Imperialist Government and the German people that should democratise itself and repudiate its dynastic rulers. A punitive settlement imposed by the Allies has been opposed, first, because it involves the punishment of millions of children, women, and many workers who could have no sort of responsibility for the war or its crimes; secondly, because it makes the victims, to whom the wrongs have been done, also the judges, executioners and beneficiaries of the punishment; and, thirdly, because such punishment itself would do nothing to remove and would be likely to make worse the general causes which have been so productive of war in the past.

The investigation of war crimes should be impartial and undertaken against whomsoever, on whichever side, they may be alleged.

8. All adjustments of boundaries must be based upon the desire of the people concerned, assured by an international supervision of the "consultation of peoples" for self-determination. ("Peoples and provinces are not to be made as part of adjustment or compromise of claims.")

9. The Settlement must conform scrupulously to the undertakings given in the Armistice—including those with reference to the operation of the blockade in so far as it affects the feeding of the enemy populations, and given also in the Declarations of Mr. Wilson, which were accepted as the basis upon which Peace should be made.

The degree to which the Terms of the Treaty violate these conditions may be gathered from a comparison, seriatim, of its points, with the relevant Labour declarations. That comparison is made below. The points of difference may be summarised as follows:—

1. In the drawing up of the Treaty the condition of "open covenants openly arrived at," which Mr. Wilson made the very first of his fourteen points, has not

been observed. Not only have the proceedings and decisions of the Conference been marked by the suppression of all opportunity for public discussion and the information of public opinion, but the commitments of secret treaties have marked the terms of the Treaty itself. In the decisions with reference to the Russian Revolution and the Socialist movements in Russia and Hungary, the democracies have been committed without their knowledge to support counter-revolutionary forces. Organised Labour, progressive and Socialist movements, have been completely without representation in the making of decisions which deeply concern the general struggle for industrial democracy.

2. The permanent causes of war—whether we regard these as mainly nationalist rivalries or economic conflict—far from being removed by the Treaty are rendered more acute and more numerous than ever. The constitution of the League of Nations affords no adequate means for their removal.

3. The policy of removing any cause for the enemy's militarism and of winning him to a peaceful international co-operation by affording him political security and economic rights through a place on equal terms with others in the League of Nations, to which Entente statesmen have again and again pledged themselves, is directly violated. President Wilson has specifically protested against a League which would be "merely a new Alliance confined to the nations associated against a common enemy." It was to be a "Universal Association," based on "guarantees taken and given," and mutual and reciprocal in its provisions; with equality alike of right and obligation. All these principles are violated in the Treaty. Germany is not included in the League of Nations; she is not to enjoy the rights and privileges she is compelled to extend to others, and there is no provision giving her opportunities to win those rights even by good behaviour. "The destruction of German militarism is offset by the intensified militarism imposed upon those of the Allies whose duty it is to hold Germany by the throat through a generation or more."

4. There is no truly international arrangement for the equitable distribution of raw material. Instead, Germany's economic life, both internal through the Reparation Commission, and external through the Allied control of raw material, is placed within the power of her former enemies and future competitors. They will be in a position to deny her population even means of livelihood. The controls over Germany are not given to the League but to the "Big Four," who are free to act on their private interest and discretion. She will be placed for years under an economic government in which she has no part: A denial of democracy and self-government.

5. The League of Nations as devised by the Paris Conference, far from being mainly a democratic organ for the legislative modification of bad international conditions likely to cause war, is a machine by which coercive power is given mainly into the hands of the executive branches of a few great Governments. The project of a Triple Alliance between France, Great Britain and America is in violation of President Wilson's undertaking: "There can be no league or alliances or special covenants and undertakings within the general and common family of the League of Nations."

6. In the matter of responsibility the Treaty makes no distinction between Imperialist and Republican Germany; between the German Government and the German people; between the immediate and the general causes of the War, which Labour, in common with President Wilson, has so often emphasised. These distinctions must be observed if the Treaty is to secure German repentance and atonement and pave the way to reconciliation and permanent peace.

7. Self-determination, the right of populations "freely to choose their allegiance" is violated in the case of the Germans of Czecho-Slovakia, of the Tyrolese Highlands, important districts in West Prussia (added to Poland for strategic and economic reasons), the important district of Menel, and during a generation the Saar Valley; and in a more limited sense by the refusal to allow German Austria to unite with the main German body, despite the declared will of the country. These cases combined will constitute a united German population many times greater than the population of Alsace-Lorraine, whose frustrated desire to rejoin France poisoned international relations for half a century.

It will be noted that very many of the Labour Manifestos insist upon the solemn obligation to adhere to the terms of Mr. Wilson's declarations.

British Labour has in its past associated itself in such a special sense with President Wilson's expressions of democratic opinion that it is particularly bound to see that the ultimate Peace Terms are in keeping therewith. But the Allied Governments are not less bound. On November 5, 1918, they transmitted, through President Wilson to the German Government, the following memorandum :—

"The Allied Governments have given careful consideration to the correspondence which has passed between the President of the United States and the German Government. Subject to the qualifications which follow, they declare their willingness to make peace with the Government of Germany on the terms of the peace laid down in the President's address to Congress of January 8, 1918, and the principles of settlement enunciated in his subsequent addresses."

The Address to Congress of January 8, 1918, is that which contained the Fourteen Points. The qualifications in the Allied Memorandum had reference to two points: "Freedom of Seas," the compensation which they stipulated should be for all damage done to the civilian population of the Allies and their property by the aggression of Germany by land, sea, and from the air.

The five points laid down by President Wilson in his speech of September 27, 1918 (these being the points referred to in the Armistice negotiations as "The President's subsequent utterances"), were as follows :—

"First, the impartial justice meted out must involve no discrimination between those to whom we wish to be just and those to whom we do not wish to be just. It must be a justice that plays no favourites and knows no standard but the equal rights of the several peoples concerned.

"Second, no special or separate interest of any single nation or any group of nations can be made the basis of any part of the settlement which is not consistent with the common interest of all.

"Third, there can be no leagues or alliances or special covenants and understandings within the general and common family of the League of Nations.

"Fourth, and more specifically, there can be no special, selfish economic combinations within the League, and no employment of any form of economic boycott or exclusion except as the power of economic penalty by exclusion from the markets of the world may be vested in the League of Nations itself as a means of discipline and control.

"Fifth, all international agreements and treaties of every kind must be made known in their entirety to the rest of the world."

These expressions of principle have been duplicated and supported by the Labour Party.

Most noticeable of all the contrasts which the draft Treaty presents to the Inter-Allied War Aims and the Fourteen Points is the fact that, whereas both the latter set out to "make the world safe for democracy" by laying down the constructive basis on which a new world can be built, the draft Treaty is concerned almost solely with the moment and with securing to the victors in the late War the immediate spoils of victory. The prophecy contained in the Inter-Allied Labour War Aims has, unfortunately, proved to be all too true. The Inter-Allied Conference (February, 1918) declared that :—

"It will be a device of the capitalist interests to pretend that the Treaty of Peace need concern itself only with the cessation of the struggle of the armed forces and with any necessary territorial adjustments."

At the Inter-Allied Conference of the Socialist and Labour Parties held on February 14, 1915, the following declaration was unanimously agreed to :—

"This Conference cannot ignore the profound general causes of the European conflict, itself a monstrous product of the antagonisms which tear asunder capitalist society and of the policy of colonial dependencies and aggressive imperialism, against which international Socialism has never ceased to fight, and in which every Government has its share of responsibility. . . .

"The Socialists of Great Britain, Belgium, France and Russia do not pursue the political and economic crushing of Germany. They are not at war with the peoples of Germany and Austria, but only with the Governments of those countries by which they are oppressed. . . .

"Socialists are none the less resolved to resist any attempt to transform this defensive war into a war of conquest, which would only prepare fresh conflicts, create new grievances, and subject various peoples more than ever to the double plague of armaments and war.

"Satisfied that they are remaining true to the principles of the International, the members of the conference express the hope that the working classes of all the different countries will before long find themselves united again in their struggle against militarism and capitalist imperialism. The victory of the Allied Powers must be a victory for popular liberty, for unity, independence and autonomy of the nations in the peaceful federation of the United States of Europe and the world."

At the Inter-Allied Conference held three years later (February 20-24, 1918) this declaration was confirmed and reproduced, and the following added :—

"Whatever may have been the objects for which the War was begun, the fundamental purpose of the Conference in supporting the continuance of the struggle so that the world may henceforth be made safe for Democracy. Of all the conditions of Peace none is so important to the peoples of the world as that there should be henceforth on earth no more war.

"Whoever triumphs, the peoples will have lost unless an international system is established which will prevent war. It would mean nothing to declare the right of peoples to self-determination if this right were left at the mercy of new violations, and was protected by a super-national authority. That authority can be no other than the League of Nations, which not only all the present belligerents, but every other independent State, should be pressed to join."

Mr. Wilson's principles were again confirmed, and his protest against any attempt to base Peace upon a re-creation of the Balance of Power reproduced.

PRESIDENT WILSON'S DECLARATIONS.

The declarations of President Wilson include the following :—

NO "PEACE OF VICTORY."—"The question upon which the whole future peace and policy of the world depends is this: Is the present war a struggle for a just and secure peace, or only for a new balance of power? . . . Victory would mean peace forced upon the loser, a victor's terms imposed upon the vanquished. It would be accepted in humiliation, under duress, at an intolerable sacrifice, and would leave a sting, a resentment, a bitter memory upon which terms of peace would rest, not permanently, but only as upon quicksand. . . . The world can be at peace only if its life is stable, and there can be no stability where the will is in rebellion, where there is no tranquillity of spirit and a sense of justice, of freedom, and of right."—Address to the Senate, January 22, 1917.

"SAFE FOR DEMOCRACY."—"We have no quarrel with the German people. . . . We are glad now that we see the facts with no false pretence about them, to fight thus for the ultimate peace of the world and for the liberation of its peoples, the German peoples included; for the rights of the nations great and small, and the privilege of men everywhere to choose their way of life and of obedience. The world must be made safe for democracy. . . . We are, let me say again, the sincere friends of the German people, and shall desire nothing so much as the early re-establishment of intimate relations of mutual advantage between us—however

hard it may be for them, for the time being, to believe that this is spoken from our hearts.”—Address to Congress, April 2, 1917.

“THE PROMISES OF THE ARMISTICE.”—“The war ended, moreover, by proposing to Germany an armistice and peace which should be founded on certain clearly defined principles which set up a new order of right and justice. Upon those principles the peace with Germany has not only been conceived, but formulated. Upon those principles it will be executed.”—Statement dealing with the Jugo-Slav dispute at Paris, April 23, 1919.

“THE FOUNDATIONS OF WAR TO BE SWEEPED AWAY.”—“We are glad to see, in short, that the very foundations of this war are swept away. Those foundations were the private choice of a small coterie of civil rulers and military staffs. Those foundations were the aggression of great Powers upon the small. Those foundations were the power of small bodies of men to wield their will and use mankind as pawns in a game. And nothing less than the emancipation of the world from these things will accomplish peace.”—Address before the Peace Conference, January 25, 1919.

“RIGHT AND JUSTICE.”—“We have used great words, all of us have used the great words ‘Right’ and ‘Justice,’ and now we are to prove whether or not we understand these words, and they are to be applied to the particular settlements which must conclude this war. And we must not only understand them, but we must have the courage to act upon our understanding.”—Speech at Buckingham Palace, December 27, 1918.

“DISINTERESTEDNESS.”—“But we cannot stand in the shadow of this war without knowing that there are things which are in some senses more difficult than those we have undertaken; because, while it is easy to speak of right and justice, it is sometimes difficult to work them out in practice, and there will be required a purity of motives and disinterestedness of object which the world has never witnessed before in the councils of nations.”—Speech to Italian Deputies at Rome, January 3, 1919.

GERMAN DECLARATIONS.

Finally, fairness demands the reproduction, and political wisdom our consideration, of the appeal made by the German Social Democratic Party to “The Socialists of all Countries.” The appeal is in these terms:—

The Versailles draft Peace Treaty has exceeded the worst expectations of the friends of peace in every country. The peace of violence which is to be forced upon us by the dictatorship of Versailles is the best justification of the attitude of German Social Democrats towards the defence of their country. We always knew what would threaten the German nation when the Imperialists of the Entente came to dictate peace to them. Therefore, we wished to try by every means to prevent this situation.

Socialists of other countries, do you now understand our attitude?

The Imperialists of other lands are no better than ours. The peace of conquest which is to be forced upon us to-day strikes at the very heart of the German Republic.

According to the plan of the capitalist Governments of France, England and America, this peace will make it impossible for a Socialist Germany to prosper, and thus at the same time strike at International Socialism.

Throughout the war we German Social Democrats advocated a peace of conciliation and of understanding among the nations, a peace which should not contain the germ of future wars. During the war, Entente statesmen frequently trumpeted forth the fact that they were only fighting for right and justice, fighting against the Kaiser and Junkerdom, but not against the German people.

But the Peace of Versailles is directed against the German people! If all the proposed economic restrictions and tyrannical financial clauses are carried out, the German workers would be enslaved for all time, and all the profits would go to the capitalists of other countries.

The German nation is prepared to make reparation for all the damage done contrary to the rights of nations at the bidding of its rulers who were overthrown by the November revolution. It is willing to be responsible for the reconstruction of Belgium and Northern France. But in order to do this it must have

ordered economic conditions. The proposed peace means a death sentence for any such conditions. Its decisions are incapable of fulfilment, and, consequently, the attempt to carry them out in detail will lead to constant friction. And so the spring of hatred will continue to flow and Europe, which has endured the horrors of war for four years, will never be at rest.

In every single point, the Versailles peace proposals are an absolute mockery of Wilson's fourteen points. There is to be no right of self-determination for the German nation. Purely German territories such as Danzig, the Netze district, and others, are to be forcibly separated from the German Republic, and their population is to be compelled to submit, without any voice in the matter whatever, to the yoke of a foreign sovereignty. Equally intolerable is the veiled annexation of the Saar Valley. Truly, Bismarck was but a miserable bungler compared with the bullies who are dismembering Germany to-day, and who, moreover, are counselling us to put out trust in a League of Nations which they alone have founded, and which they will continue to dominate for the permanent subjection of the German nation.

Peace conditions such as these, which are a mockery of all justice, cannot produce a lasting peace. They breed hatred. They would facilitate the nationalist propaganda of the reactionaries and render the enlightenment of the masses by the socialists more difficult. They would become a perpetual menace to peace.

After the terrible human slaughter which has lasted more than four years, to preserve world peace must be the principal task of the workers of all countries. The Socialists of the belligerent countries have recognised this. At Berne, the Socialists of neutral countries united with those of Europe in the formulation of a joint peace programme. They protested against any falsification of the Wilson principles, and for such questions as those of Danzig and the Saar Valley, endeavoured to find solutions which would not contain the germ of fresh wars.

The Socialists of all countries solemnly recognised that German peoples should have the right of remaining within the German State, and that the German-Austrians should have the right to unite with their German brothers. The Entente Governments contemptuously disregard all such attempts to secure permanent peace, and prefer to rely upon force.

Will the Socialist International raise its voice so loudly against this peace of violence that the present day rulers in the victorious countries will be obliged to listen to it?

We are waiting for this. But it is high time!

The German nation is on the point of being destroyed. But far more than this is involved; the fate of Europe itself is at stake! Following on this horrible world tragedy, the masses in all lands will have to endure unheard of sufferings. If one nation is completely destroyed, all the others will suffer. Therefore, workers of all lands, join your forces to prevent this peace of violence, which would not bring rest to Europe, and would do the greatest injury to the Socialist movement in all countries.

The German Independent Socialist Party has made an appeal in the following terms:—

The peace offered to the German nation by the Entente is a peace of violence of the worst possible kind. Territories with wholly German populations, which desire to live in political community with the German nation are to be separated from it against their will. The projected annexation of the Saar Valley is scarcely even veiled. The north-eastern strip of East Prussia, which regards itself as one with the German nation, is being torn from it by force. The whole of East Prussia is to be cut off from the German Empire. Danzig is apparently to be converted into an independent State; in reality, it is being handed over to Poland, against the will of the inhabitants. Elsewhere, too, as in West and East Prussia, in Posen, and in Silesia, the right of self-determination, which we claim should be applied to all territories, is being ignored.

The economic life of the German nation is being strangled, the proletariat enslaved, and the foundation of fresh international conflicts is being laid. All peace ideals are being shattered by the brutal spirit of imperialism.

From the very beginning the Independent Socialist Party proclaimed the imperialist character of the war, and, undeterred by abuse and persecution, it fought in the Press, in public meetings, and in parliaments, against the crime of ruthless human murder and the senseless destruction of national strength and economic wealth. It demanded the cessation of the war long before any one of

the belligerent Powers had gained an ascendancy over another. The old régime supported by all parties except the Independent Socialist Party, forced a peace of incredible violence upon the Russians at Brest-Litovsk, and upon the Roumanians at Bucharest. It thereby increased the hatred of Germany, and by its restoration of militarism, the present Government has intensified that hatred and distrust. Thus is the German nation being driven into the abyss, of which the International Socialist Party has so often warned them.

We have no hope of securing essential modifications of the conditions of the Allied imperialists, whose influence in the peace negotiations plays such an all-important part, the more especially as the composition of the Government and of the Peace Delegation cannot inspire the other Governments with confidence. Even if no considerable changes are effected in the course of the negotiations which have begun, we have ultimately no other alternative than to submit to pressure, and sign the treaty. A refusal to sign would mean the retention of our prisoners of war, the occupation of all districts producing raw material, the tightening of the blockade, unemployment, famine, terrible mortality—it would, in short, involve an unspeakable catastrophe which, in the end, would compel us to sign. And it would be the working classes which would suffer most from the consequences. However harsh and oppressive it may be, peace is a necessary condition for our very existence, quite apart from the restoration of our social and economic life demanded by the revolutionary working-class. The Peace of Brest-Litovsk and that of Bucharest have been of short duration, and we are convinced that the Peace of Versailles will also be shattered by revolutionary developments.

We observe with satisfaction that the Socialists of other countries, in England, France, Italy, and America, have organised resistance against this peace of violence.

The working-class considers it an insult that the German nation should be called upon to give its united support to a Government, which is constantly—ever since its appeal to the people—calling out the soldiery against sections of the people, which butchers masses of working-people, which sacrifices freedom by the unjustifiable proclamation and maintenance of martial law, which suppresses the revolutionary Press because it does not meet with its approval, which fills prisons, reformatories, and military prisoners' camps with victims of political persecution, and permits military tribunals to wreak vengeance on the working-classes.

We call upon all members of our Party, men and women, to realise the gravity of the situation, not to be led astray by talk of patriotism, but to stand firm in revolutionary resolve. Capitalism offers no hope of salvation, either to you or to the German nation. Your prosperity, the prosperity of the German nation, and of the whole world, depends upon the progress of the revolution, which will free the working-class world from capitalism and its wars, and bring about the realisation of Socialism and Peace.

Workers of all lands, rise and unite against international capitalism. Fight boldly and resolutely for the emancipation of the working-classes. Fight against capitalism and nationalism, fight for peace, for Socialism, for world-revolution! (1)

Note on Brest-Litovsk and Versailles.

The German Socialists have been much blamed for failing to protest by their votes in the Reichstag against the treaty of Brest, which has been described as the acme of vindictive cruelty and oppression. Yet in many respects the provisions of Brest were more favourable to Russia than are the Versailles terms to Germany.

Indemnity. Germany demanded from Russia a definite sum, namely 6,000 millions of marks, at the time worth roughly 150 million pounds, or at to-day's exchange £100 million. A portion of this sum the Germans were willing to accept in Russian paper money.

The Allies have compelled Germany to agree to the payment of a sum as yet undetermined, and to be determined by them alone, demanding on account £5,000 million payable in gold or its equivalent at their exclusive valuation. Thus the Versailles indemnity is at least thirty times as heavy as the Brest one.

(1) From *Freiheit*, 12th May, 1919.

Treaties. (Brest, art. 6). Russia is obliged only to recognise the treaty of peace concluded between Germany and the Ukraine (in its economic parts almost identical with the Russian treaty), but Germany is compelled to give in advance her consent to a large number of treaties to be concluded in the future.

(Article 13.) For the interpretation of the Brest treaty, the German and Russian text was official, Versailles recognises only an English and a French text, ignoring the language of the enemy.

Brest (supplementary ch., 2 articles 3 & 4) revives all pre-war treaties between the parties giving them reciprocal rights to have treaties, etc., revised, and failing revision those cancelled which in their opinion no longer correspond to new conditions.

Versailles (art., 289e) gives each Allied power the one-sided right to notify to Germany which pre-war treaties it wishes to revive. Germany has no right to give such notification, but will be held to acquiesce in the revival of such treaties only as the Allies select.

Occupied Territory (art. 4). Germany agreed to evacuate all genuine Russian territory as soon as (1) the demobilisation of the Russian Army should be complete, (2) the general peace should be concluded. Versailles provides for a 15-year occupation of indisputably German territory.

Private Rights. Brest (Supplementary ch., 3, arts. 6 & 7) annuls for both parties equally all war-time legislation imposing restrictions upon the civil rights of "enemy subjects."

Versailles provides "most favoured nation treatment" in Germany for the subjects of any and every Allied State, but does not grant any reciprocal rights to German subjects; on the contrary, most stringent anti-alien legislation is now being passed in this country.

Enemy Property. Brest (ch. 3 arts. 13-15) orders all private property belonging to subjects of either country under administration or custody of an "enemy state" to be returned to its rightful owner.

Versailles (art. 297) gives such right only to Allied subjects in certain cases. Brest gives reciprocal compensation to subjects of both parties for losses suffered in the enemy countries through exceptional war-time legislation, such damage to be assessed by mixed Arbitral Tribunals, composed of Russians, Germans and Swiss in equal numbers, a Swiss as Chairman.

Versailles, which provides for similar mixed Arbitral Tribunals, grants right to such compensation exclusively to Allied subjects, ruling out all corresponding claims by German subjects.

Prize Courts. Brest (art. 29) confirms for both sides equally the judgments given by prize courts, Versailles confirms only the judgments of Allied prize courts, giving the Allies the right to examine the findings of the German courts.

Rights in Industrial, Literary and Artistic Property, Patent Rights. Brest (arts. 9-11), re-establishes these rights on a basis of complete reciprocity, Versailles establishes them for Allied subjects, but subjects German-owned rights to the effects of Allied war legislation and other conditions.

Free Ports. Brest (art. 4) provides for free zones for Russian trade within the ports of Riga, Reval, Windau. This is more than the Allies have done for Austria, say, at Trieste and Fiume.

PART II.

THE TREATY CLAUSES AND LABOUR'S DECLARATIONS: A SERIATIM COMPARISON.

CHAPTER I.

THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

Labour has always sought in the League of Nations, not so much an alliance of governments for coercion as a parliament of peoples for altering the conditions which, unaltered, would lead to war: why the Covenant fails as such an instrument and some of the changes which are necessary.

The following are the outstanding characteristics of the League of Nations as outlined in the Covenant:—

1. The controlling power of the League is given to the "Council," consisting of *one* representative of each of the Great Powers, thus making it a small diplomatic cabinet of ministers or diplomats responsible not to the Assembly of the League of Nations, but each to his own Government. It is thus an Alliance of Governments.

2. Since Germany is excluded from the Council it makes it an Alliance of one group as against a rival group.

3. The "Assembly," which is the nearest approach to an international legislature, will be composed of three representatives of each constituent State, but *voting as one*. Haiti, or Nicaragua or Liberia, will be as powerful as Great Britain or the United States, rendering it undemocratic in the sense that by virtue of the equality of States as thus realised, a citizen of Haiti or Nicaragua or Liberia will have in it very many times the voting power of the Englishman or American. It is certain to lose authority in favour of the Council.

4. The Members of the Leagues are not bound to disarmament, only to future vague consideration of the problem.

5. The League is condemned beforehand to impotence in dealing with the economic causes of conflict, since it is not the League but the Allies who are to have control of the world's economic system, or of Germany's relation thereto. Germany is placed under the economic governance not of a truly international authority, but under the power of her chief industrial and commercial competitors.

6. The authority and arrangements for most of the plebiscites called by the Treaty are not under the League but under the Allies.

7. The Treaty, with which the Covenant is bound up, and which must be accepted as a collateral obligation, permits both economic discrimination and partial Alliances within the League.

In all these points it violates Labour declarations.

The Labour Party Annual Conference of 1919 demands:—

Germany's "speedy admission to the League of Nations."

The Joint Manifesto of the National Executive of the Labour Party and the Parliamentary Labour Party states:—

"A League of Nations, to be effective, should be an organ of international justice, inclusive of all free peoples, and not, as it will be under the Peace Treaty, a restricted instrument of the victorious coalition. This essential aim can best be attained by the admission of Germany to membership of the League as speedily as possible after her signature to the Peace Treaty. The League should also be strengthened by being made more directly representatives of peoples and Parliaments."

The Memorandum of War Aims (1918) demanded that the League should :—

1. Include all present belligerents.
2. Should supervise the " Consultation of Peoples " for self-determination.
3. Ensure that the conduct of foreign policy should be placed under the control of popular legislators.
4. Secure the concerted abolition of compulsory military service in all countries; prohibition of fresh armaments; limitation of existing armaments; and the entire abolition of profit-making armament firms.

The Berne International Labour and Socialist Conference demanded that :—

" Representation in the central organ of the League should be not by the delegates of the executive branches of the governments of the constituent States, but by delegates from the Parliaments representing all parties therein, thus ensuring not an alliance of cabinets or governments, but a union of peoples."

All these provisions are violated in lesser or greater degree by the terms of the proposed League of Nations.

The Permanent Commission of the Labour and Socialist International at Amsterdam, April 26-29, passed the following resolution :—

" The Conference is of opinion that the League of Nations will only attain its object :—

1. *If it is composed, from the beginning, of all the independent nations of the world who are willing to accept the obligations of the covenants, having equal rights and duties, and whose delegations have been elected by their Parliaments.*

2. *If a super-national authority is empowered to secure the carrying out of all obligations undertaken, whether under the Treaty of Peace or under the covenant of the League of Nations. This super-national authority is, moreover, to be entrusted with the duty of establishing international regulations, having as their object the gradual abolition of all legal hindrances to international commerce and the international organisation of world production and distribution.*

3. *If, with the object of finally arriving at total disarmament by land and sea, the League of Nations at once takes measures to prohibit fresh armaments, bring about the progressive reduction of existing armaments, and control the manufacture of such armaments as may still be permitted. In order to prevent any danger to democracy, such armed forces as may be required by the international situation, so long as total disarmament has not been effected, shall be placed under the control of the League of Nations, as regards both the number of effectives and the method of recruiting.*

4. *If all the nations forming the League of Nations are obliged to submit all questions which may arise to the decision of the League, and bind themselves to accept these decisions and exclude recourse to war under any circumstances whatever.*

5. *If, in order to attain this end the Governments adopt the method of open diplomacy, as employed by President Wilson with regard to the difference between Italy and the Yugo-Slavs, as this method guarantees that the claims of the different nations shall be settled strictly on the justice of each case and in the only way calculated to assist the permanency of a world peace.*

These conditions have not yet been realised by the Paris Conference, and the Conference therefore appeals for effective action on the part of the workers of all countries, who should raise their protest and demand that the League of Nations shall be organised on the solid basis of a durable peace."

The Committee of Action of the Berne International Labour and Socialist Conference issued a Manifesto at Paris on May 11 in the following terms :—

" The Committee draws the attention of the Socialist and Labour movements to the following points in particular :—

" The League of Nations in the final form retains all the objections taken to it

at Berne and Amsterdam. It remains a League of Governments and Executives and not of peoples and parliaments. It does not compel its affiliated nations to renounce totally a recourse to war by accepting its arbitration and decisions. It also seems to be the instrument of a victorious condition dominated by five great Powers rather than an organ of international justice upon which all nations ought to find a place.

"Though the League of Nations as at present constituted may be the beginning of a methodical organisation of a continuous regime of peace, the failure to include Germany and Russia must be righted as speedily as possible if the League is to be made effective for preventing war."

The Special Meeting convened by the Trades Union Congress and the Labour Party to consider amendments to the Covenant of the League (held April 3, 1919) passed the following :—

"That the Body of Delegates should be chosen from the National Parliaments by some such method as Proportional Representation, so as to secure an accurate representation of national opinion. Each nation should have five representatives and have votes upon a graded system.

"That the Executive Council shall consist of eleven members, including representatives from the five Allied Powers and from Germany and Russia; and that it be so constituted as not to be independent of the Body of Delegates.

"That the regulation of the activities of the League shall be under the control of the Body of Delegates and not of the Executive Council.

"That the International Secretariat shall be under the final control of the Body of Delegates and not of the Executive Council.

"That, as Article VII. contemplates the starting of the League without invitations being sent to Russia or any of the late enemy countries, the Article be re-drafted so as to provide that these countries may take part in the inauguration of the League.

"That, any country accepting the purposes, the constitution and the obligations of the League, may notify its willingness to join the League, and if there be no objection on the part of a majority of the Executive Council, shall be admitted a member of the League, but if there be such objection the decision shall rest with a majority of the Body of Delegates. The debates on this subject must be held in public.

"That no armies should be raised by conscription.

"That, as 'geographical considerations' carry with them policies of national defence by rival armaments, their mention in Article VIII. assumes a military menace which the League of Nations ought to remove and not encourage.

"That the manufacture of armaments should be under the direct control of the League, as well as whatever forces are necessary for police purposes.

"That, as there is no real security for Peace which does not include national disarmament, a declaration to that effect should be included in this article.

"That on the International Bureau of Labour, Labour be directly and adequately represented, and that the interests of women be also represented.

"That Article XXI. should include a declaration that its final purpose is to secure freedom of commerce between States."

Note on the Representative Principles in League.

It will be noted that the most important Amendments of Labour bear on the introduction of a more truly representative element into the machinery of the League, particularly the representation of minority parties.

It is an open secret that powerful groups, in both the American and the British delegations to the official Conference in Paris, were in favour of an amendment to the Covenant as it now exists, which should embody the principle indicated in the Berne Resolution. This amendment aimed at carrying out the principle of the Berne proposal by the creation, in addition to the Body of Delegates, of a Representative Assembly, so constituted as to ensure due representation of all political parties in the nations belonging to the League.

Why is the addition of a truly Representative Assembly (even though it had only powers of recommendation) the most important amendment to the Covenants which Labour could secure? Why cannot the principle of minority representation be carried into effect by modifying the form or powers of the existing Body of Delegates?

To deal with the first question.

The real effectiveness of a League of Nations will depend upon its being a suitable instrument for changing the conditions which lead to conflict and to war. It will serve no purpose to provide force for compulsory arbitration or juridical decision of the law and practice on which a Court's decision must be based are themselves unjust. If Europe had been in a position in 1914 to have compelled Austria to submit its difference with Serbia over the Sarajevo murders to arbitration, the Court could not have allowed Serbia to raise the Southern Slav question, which was the real cause of the conflict between the two countries. The Court would have been compelled, on the basis of "international law," to support Austria's right, if she so chose, to make economic arrangements in the matter of tariffs and railroads that might strangle Serbia's development. In the same way, the old international "law" could do nothing for a land-locked State embarrassed in its access to the sea by burdensome railroad rates along the line of route outside its borders. Compulsory arbitration will always be inadequate to prevent conflict so long as the Court is unable to deal with the causes of conflict.

A Court cannot alter the law. That is the business of a legislature, and we shall have made an immense step in a more scientific conception of the League of Nations when we come to put more emphasis upon the legislative—law-changing and making—side of its task, and less upon its juridical and coercive side. For force itself can only be employed against an offender when there is agreement between the various parties using the force as to what the law should be. Our very alliances are menaced with disruption and incapacity to unite their forces so long as the causes of conflict remain unremoved. Again, that removal is a task legislative in its character.

Why is the Body of Delegates likely to prove an unsuitable organ of international legislation? Because it represents States, not people. Britain must cast one vote on a given question: a Conservative capitalist employer and a Socialist worker, in flat contradiction the one with the other on every principle, must both vote in the same lobby as an effective representation of the 45,000,000 people of Great Britain. Such a system reduces popular representation to an absurdity. In practice the members of the proposed Body of Delegates will, in fact, be the nominees of the executive branch of their Governments, since even if one represents opposition parties, the three must vote as one. This means that Cabinet opinion alone has voting power. Thus, while the most elementary of democratic precaution denies legislative powers to the executive at home, that executive—or even its nominees—has complete legislative power when it comes to the most important legislation of all, that concerning the conditions which determine war or peace.

The Body of Delegates as at present devised in the Covenant accepts the principle that all States are equal: the United States will have three delegates voting as one, Nicaragua will have three voting as one, which means that every citizen of Nicaragua will have 1.139 times (or some such multiple) the voting power in international affairs than has

the American citizen. The equality of States means the inequality of men.

Yet the small nations for whose survival the War has, in a sense, been waged, will fight for the maintenance of the principle of State equality somewhere in the world constitution. There must be some organ giving every small State representation. To increase the number of delegates all round does not get over the difficulty. The only way out is some application of the principle embodied in the American Constitution: there must be one body in which all the *States* are represented by an equal number of delegates, another in which the *people* are proportionately represented. Thus, while in the American Senate a little State like Rhode Island has as many representatives (two) as a great State like Pennsylvania, in the House of Representatives, the latter State has thirty-two representatives as against the former's two. Ultimately some such device must be employed in the representation of the Nations. Details are difficult, but not impossibly so.

Why is the representation of minority, or "opposition," opinion important? Because, as we have seen, one opinion or one vote can never fairly represent a country. Even the Covenant recognises this when it comes to deep realities like the representation of Labour and Capital. In the arrangements for representation on the Labour Charter both Employers and Labour from each country have representatives. But what would be the use of there being a Labour representative and an Employers' representative if both had to vote as one? This is so obvious that in the case of this particular Labour Parliament the delegates have the right to vote as individuals. But in the League of Nations itself each country must give one vote—Labour, Capitalist, Conservative, Socialist, all must somehow vote in agreement as "Nations."

There is a further point. The Opposition of to-day may be the Government of to-morrow, and because no Governmental party can, in fact, speak for a whole nation, many Governments (and not alone in Russia) represent a minority. If the American Congress had been represented in Paris Mr. Wilson's Congressional difficulties would have been less. The Prinkipo suggestion was a blundering attempt to meet the need for hearing all political parties. In a Europe in flux, as Europe will be for a generation, perhaps, it will be extremely difficult to say whether a given Government represents the nation. Who will say that such and such a Finnish or Ukrainian Government is more representative than a previous one? To say that only the Governmental parties will be represented is to put a premium upon rebellion and secession, for the rule is a standing temptation to a political group to seize power by force as the only means of securing any representation whatever internationally; and to a disaffected area to secede, and so become a State with voting power in the world's affairs.

As for class interests—the vast groupings that cut clean athwart national frontiers—some plan of "minority" representation is the only means of securing their constitutional expression, as it is the best means of attenuating the rigidity and harshness of national frontier lines.

Labour Party Memorandum.

In this connection the reader may be referred to some notes on "A Parliament of the League of Nations" included in the Labour Party Memorandum on "International Labour Legislation" (price, 1s.),

Section XI. It seems worth while to reproduce here the following passages :—

“ If a joint Cabinet is to administer, it seems to follow that a joint Parliament must be created to criticise its work.

“ So long as international action is confided only to Governments, it may be doubted whether we shall ever escape from the obsession of force. It is a fiction that any Premier or Foreign Secretary represents a nation. He represents the nation as Power. It does not think unanimously. It acts, however, as a single force, because its army, fleet, and treasury obey a single command. The real divisions of class and opinion which make the life of the nation are obliterated before this artificial unity is achieved. The result will be that on these councils of Cabinets the true solidarity of human masses, which think alike across frontiers, will not be reflected. There will be coalitions based, after bargaining, on assumedly national interest, i.e., on the interests of the ruling class, but there will be no genuine associations based on common principles. The real basis of internationalism, the common thoughts and interests of populations, will not be reflected.

“ The only organ which could give this reflection would be a genuine Parliament, based on proportional representation. That would at once bring together common opinions and common interests across national frontiers. A Socialist Party would at once be formed, then, perhaps, a Clerical Party, and gradually other shades would coalesce. The result would be to diminish the importance of the State as power, and to emphasise the sovereignty of opinion. The class line of cleavage would be seen to be international, and a great step would be gained in emancipating the workers from the obsessions of a narrow nationalism. Precisely for this reason our opponents will resist, and we ought to promote the idea.

“ Two methods of choosing the League's Parliament are conceivable. One is by direct election, proportionally, on a basis of population, with very large constituencies, which might be entire nations. By far the easier plan would be that the popular House in each national Parliament should elect the national delegation by proportional representation. Thus each national delegation would reflect the composition of the Parliament. If the Parliament itself were fairly elected, the result would be a reasonably exact mirror of national opinion.

“ It might be convenient to create European, American, and Asiatic Chambers of the League's Parliament, from which large delegations would be sent to compose the World Parliament.

“ The assembly so constituted would at first be deliberative only. It should have the right to call before it spokesmen of the Executive of the League, and of all its Commissions, to receive their reports, to question them, to interpellate them, and to record its opinions by vote. It ought also to have the right of initiative to suggest new administrative departures to the executive, or to draft new proposals of legislation, for submission to the Conference of Governments. Certain limits to its powers are obvious. It could not dismiss the Executive (though it might censure it), for it could not overturn the Cabinets of the constituent States. Neither could it tax, unless the League should invent certain international sources of revenue. Nor could it legislate, though it might propose legislation to be afterwards ratified by the national Parliaments. It would, none the less, exert an enormous moral power, and more swiftly than any association of Governments, would mould opinion to accept the international idea. Eventually, after a long period of evolution, it might become strong enough to set up its own Executive and transform the League into a true federation.

“ Our ‘ Internationale ’ would remain a powerful instrument of organisation and agitation. It could never control the League, however, unless, indeed, we look forward to the revolutionary triumph of the Soviet idea. Those who reject that conception are bound to work for the democratic evolution of the League of Nations on the basis of Parliamentary forms.”

RECOMMENDATIONS.

“ That the Conference shall propose the inclusion in the governing machinery of the League of Nations of a Deliberative International Parliament, composed of delegations chosen by proportional representation from each national Parliament. Its functions should be to create an international public opinion, to bring it to bear upon the Executive and Commissions of the League in their administrative action, and to prepare drafts or suggestions of international legislation for the Conference of the League.”

So much for the two points of the immediate admission of Germany and the machinery of representation. There remains the no less important question of the relation of the League to the economic government of the world. This is dealt with in part in this Handbook, under the heading of the general economic clauses of the Treaty. On this point, also, the reader is referred to Sections XII. and XIII. of the Labour Party "Memorandum on International Legislation." The following passages thereof are here reproduced for his convenience :—

"It is of the utmost importance, if the League of Nations is to be a reality and not merely an association of diplomatists, that its economic structure should receive fully as much attention as its political structure. The League of Nations that is required is not merely an *ad hoc* association for the prevention of war by conciliation or arbitration, but at least the groundwork of a real system of international co-operation in peace as well as in the prevention of disputes. This means that the economic functions of the League must be clearly defined, and that every effort must be made to preserve those forms of war-time co-operation, which are at once valuable and capable of being incorporated in the permanent structure of the League.

"This is essential even if a narrow point of view is taken and the problem is considered only in its bearings on the proposed international Labour Charter. International Labour legislation has little chance of real success unless it forms a part of a wider system of international economic co-operation."

"There is an inclination in some quarters to press for the establishment of a Labour section of the League of Nations, entirely divorced from any economic section which may be established to deal with trading and economic questions generally. To adopt this policy would be a great mistake, and would doom the Labour section to comparative ineffectiveness. As soon as any attempt is made to establish by means of an international Labour Charter minimum Labour conditions and rights in all countries, it is seen that each proposal made raises intricate economic questions, which go far beyond the narrower sphere of merely Labour legislation. For instance, the question of international competition at once arises, and it is impossible to get States to agree to reasonable Labour conditions as long as international economic policy is conducted on lines of unrestricted competition and virtual 'warfare' between the various States. Labour questions cannot be divorced from questions of markets, and the only basis upon which an effective international Labour Charter can be built up is that of international co-operation in the economic sphere as a whole."

"It is not, however, enough to ensure the continuance of economic co-operation during the emergency period, except in the sense that such continuance will go a long way to ensure the permanence of the machinery when once its benefits have been generally appreciated. It is also necessary to make this international machinery an integral and permanent part of the structure of the League of Nations. This does not mean that systems of international rationing of materials must be retained when the supplies are enough for all, and when the credit position is such that they are actually being fairly allocated without international interference. But it does mean that the League of Nations must have permanent machinery for ensuring that these conditions are maintained. Among the necessary functions of this economic section of the League would be the following :—

"1. To assist in the maintenance of credit, i.e., purchasing power, in the various countries at such a level as will ensure (a) a fair allocation of supplies of materials, etc.; (b) stimulation of supply of important materials by promoting production in the various countries; (c) no unnecessary disturbance of world market conditions through a breakdown of purchasing power in a particular country owing to preventable causes.

"2. To prevent exploitation by trust, operating in the world market, whether of interests concerned in production, transport, or distribution, and to control the operations of international firms and combines.

"3. To regulate the granting of concessions in undeveloped countries, and to safeguard such countries from unfair exploitation or monopolisation by particular interests.

"4. To secure the enforcement of international conventions, in the matter of the open door and other matters, and to prevent their evasion by secret rebates, concessions, etc.

" 5 To promote international economic conventions based on the widest possible measure of international co-operation, e.g., commercial treaties, Labour conventions, traffic agreements, and so forth.

" 6. To undertake the international allocation of supplies of which there is a shortage, or which are in danger of being monopolised by a particular nation or interest to the detriment of others.

" 7. To promote the formation of international conferences or Councils in various industries and economic groups, in order to secure the greatest possible measure of co-operation in each industry or group."

CHAPTER II.

RESPONSIBILITY AND PUNISHMENT.

The Treaty is in flagrant violation of the principles enunciated not only by Labour, but by President Wilson.

There are certain points in the problem of responsibility and punishment upon which the great Inter-Allied Labour Bodies are in practical agreement. They are these :—

1. Reparation is due from Germany for the devastation caused by the War.
2. The immediate responsibility for the War rests with the former Imperial Government of Germany.

3. "The profound general causes of the European Conflict, itself a monstrous product of the antagonisms which tear asunder capitalist society, and the aggressive policy of colonialism and imperialism, against which Socialism has never ceased to fight, and in which every Government has its share of responsibility" (1) cannot be ignored.

4. Distinction must be made between the guilt of an autocratic Government acting in secret, uncontrolled by popular institutions, and the guilt of the people as a whole, often deceived as to the facts of the war, and who, in many cases, as the result of this deception, honestly (however mistakenly) believed that War to be defensive.

5. Clear distinction should be made between the Peace policy, which might be necessary in the case of a reactionary German monarchy and that which it would be safe and wise to adopt towards a revolutionary Socialist Republic. To declare that whatever Germany may do in the way of democratization will make no difference in the Allied treatment of her is to aid German reaction and to be false to many Allied declarations.

6. Punishment, as distinct from reparation, should fall, not upon the nation as a whole, which necessarily includes very many completely innocent persons (as the children, the politically uninstructed), but upon the guilty individuals (to whichever side they may belong) impartially and justly tried.

These principles are revealed in the following declarations :—

"On the question of reparation, Labour always insisted that Germany must make full reparation for the wanton destruction in all the Allied countries, and we consider that the payment by Germany of the sum of 5,000 millions is not excessive in view of the damage done." (2)

"The invasion of Belgium and France by the German Armies threatens the very existence of independent nationalities, and strikes a blow at all faith in Treaties. In these circumstances a victory for German Imperialism would be the defeat and destruction of democracy and liberty in Europe." (3)

(1) Quotation from resolution of the Inter-Allied Conference of Feb., 1915, repeated and re-approved in the Conference of Feb., 1918.

(2) Manifesto of the National Executive of the Labour Party and Parliamentary Labour Party.

(3) Inter-Allied Labour and Socialist Conference, Feb. 14, 1915, repeated and re-affirmed at Inter-Allied Conference. Feb., 1918.

"The Conference declares that whatever may have been the cause of the outbreak of war, it is clear that the peoples of Europe, who are necessarily the chief sufferers from its horrors, had themselves no hand in it."

"The Socialists of Great Britain, Belgium, France, Italy, and Russia do not pursue the political and economic crushing of Germany; they are not at war with the peoples, but only with the Governments by which they are oppressed." (1)

"The Berne Conference acknowledges that, so far as it is concerned, the question of the immediate responsibility for the war has been made clear, both by the discussions and by the declaration of the German Majority, affirming the revolutionary spirit of New Germany and its complete separation from the old system which was responsible for the war.

"In welcoming the German Revolution and the development of Democratic and Socialist institutions which it involves, the Conference sees the way clear for the common work of the International.

"The further declaration made by the German delegates in the course of the debate on the League of Nations, has convinced the Conference that, from now onward, the united working classes of the whole world will prove the most powerful guarantee for the suppression of all militarism and of every attempt to destroy international democracy." (2)

Mr. Wilson's statements in this connection are worth quotation.

After the American declaration of war upon Germany he said :—

"We have no quarrel with the German people. . . . It was not upon their impulse that their Government acted in entering this War. It was not with their previous knowledge or approval. . . . The American people have suffered intolerable wrongs at the hands of the Imperial German Government, but they desire no reprisal upon the German people, who have themselves suffered all things in this war, which they did not choose.

"The people of Germany are being told by the men whom they now permit to deceive them and to act as their masters that they are fighting for the very life and existence of their Empire, a war of desperate self-defence against deliberate aggression. . . . No one is threatening the . . . peaceful enterprises of the German Empire. . . . The wrongs, the very deep wrongs committed in this war . . . cannot and must not be righted by the commission of similar wrongs against Germany and her allies."

"Punitive damages, the dismemberment of empires, the establishment of selfish and exclusive economic leagues, we deem inexpedient, and in the end worse than futile; no proper basis for a peace of any kind, least of all for an enduring peace."—Reply to the Pope, August 27, 1917.

"They (the American people) insist that the war shall not end in vindictive action of any kind; that no nation or people shall be robbed or punished because the irresponsible rulers of a single country have themselves done deep and abominable wrong. It is this thought that has been expressed in the formula: 'No annexations, no contributions, no punitive indemnities.' . . . We shall be free to base peace on generosity and justice to the exclusion of all selfish claims to advantage on the part of the victors. No one is threatening the existence or the independence or the peaceful enterprise of the German Empire. . . . No representative of any self-governed nation will dare disregard it (the opinion of the world) by attempting any such covenants of selfishness and compromise as were entered into at the Congress of Vienna."—Address to Congress, December 4, 1917.

The reasons for the distinctions made by the Labour Party, and for the adherence to the principles enumerated by it, and the Allied statesmen just quoted, are obvious.

(1) Memorandum on War Aims, Inter-Allied Conference, 1918.

(2) Berne Conference, 1919. The declaration of the German Majority referred to, whose declaration was embodied in the report adopted by the Conference, was in these terms: "By the revolution the German proletariat has overthrown and destroyed the old system which was responsible for the war. German Democracy, however one may judge its policy in detail during the war, has now, by its action, shown its firm determination to devote all its strength to the reconstruction of the world ruined by war, and to fight in the spirit and service of the International side by side with the Socialists of all countries, for the realisation of Socialism within the League of Nations."

While it is true that even a Treaty strictly conforming to these principles would still bear very hardly upon the German people, and appear harsh to them, it would not be a permanent bar to peace. It would stand the test of examination by a Germany recovered from the bitterness of war and defeat, and would ultimately be no obstacle to a better temper. If, on the other hand, these conditions are not adhered to, if, despite our implied promises to the contrary, Labour allows revolutionary and democratic Germany to be treated as harshly as would be an autocratic one; if punishments fall as much upon the innocent as the guilty; if all the professions (made not only by Allied Labour but by Allied statesmen) as to our fighting for the freedom and welfare of the German people as much as our own prove vain, then we shall have closed the door to the possibility of German repentance and atonement, and have made just that peace against which President Wilson so eloquently warned us:—

“Victors’ terms imposed upon the vanquished . . . leaving a sting, a resentment, a bitter memory upon which terms of peace would rest, not permanently, but only as upon a quicksand.” (1)

In estimating the character of the Treaty, in this, as in other of its features, we can, it is true, take into consideration the fact that much will depend upon the way the Treaty is interpreted and applied by the Allies. They may not demand their pound of flesh. They may, of grace, accord opportunities, economic and other, to which Germany under the terms of the Treaty has no defined right. But the very fact renders it important for Labour to realise (in order that its influence may be exercised for the purpose of preventing the development of international conditions leading to further conflict) just what this Treaty under the stimulus of commercial greed and national animosities might become.

The terms of the Treaty, as they stand, are in violation of the principles outlined above at least to this extent:—

(1) They disregard the profound general causes of the War so emphasised in the Inter-Allied Conferences of 1915 and 1918, and compel the present German Republic to assume, not merely a defined and limited responsibility for reparation to France, Belgium, Britain, Serbia, and Russia, and the other belligerents, but, by implication, the whole moral guilt for the entrance of even Japan, Italy, and Roumania into the War, notwithstanding the special circumstances of the belligerence of these last-named States; and to assume an indeterminate material responsibility. (2) The terms fail in impartiality in demanding only inquiry into and punishment only of German offences. (3) They set up purely Allied, instead of international, tribunals to try those offences. (4) The failure to accord to Germany assured access to necessary elements of industrial life, threaten very seriously the “peaceful enterprises” of the German people which Allied statesmen declared would be respected. (5) They thus fail to accord what every civilised state accords to individual criminals (as a necessary part of their reclamation), the protection of the law, and the restoration of rights when the defined penalty of crime shall have been paid. (6) The prospective penalty (like that already suffered through the blockade) falls with particular severity upon the women, the children, the old, the invalids, without reference to their special guilt. (7) The territorial provisions create very large “irredentist” German populations.

(1) January 22nd, 1917.

CHAPTER III.

REPARATION AND RESTITUTION: ECONOMIC CLAUSES.

Labour for restitution, but against economic imperialism and war after the war. How "selfish economic combinations" create war. A warning as to "Preference." The need for international control of raw material if there is to be equality of economic opportunity. Why Labour is interested in preventing famine conditions in Germany.

The various declarations in which Labour has pronounced for the principle of complete restoration and restitution by Germany have already been given.⁽¹⁾ It will be noted that the Joint Manifesto of the National Executive of the Labour Party and the Parliamentary Labour Party supports the principle of a defined and a limited, as against an indeterminate, indemnity.

A word as to the reasons which justify this preference.

It has become quite evident during the course of the deliberations of the Paris Conference that two contradictory tendencies have made themselves felt: the interests that hope to profit by the "capture of German trade" naturally do not desire to see German industry once more in a highly flourishing condition. Yet if Germany is to pay vast sums for restoration or indemnity, her population must be set to work as actively as possible; her industry must be completely re-established. It must be remembered that in order to have means of payment, she must not only be permitted to manufacture, but the goods she makes must be sent abroad. There is no other way by which she can pay the sums whatever the financial mechanism of the thing—the creation of bonds which she shall be compelled to deliver to the Allies or what not—the ultimate fact in the operation will be the export of German goods to Allied or neutral countries. And if the Allies really are to exact the sums commonly mentioned, Germany is destined by virtue of the very demands made upon her by the Allies, to become not only one of the most highly industrialised of modern nations, but the one having the greatest export trade in the world. If relatively small sums only were required, payment might be made by means of ships, coal, potash, building materials, in such a way as not to establish German trade in foreign markets. But if the payments are to go on for a long series of years and to amount to the vast sums represented by any considerable proportion of the Allied debts, the exports will have to cover a very much wider range of goods.

Here, then, is the dilemma of those who would make Germany pay great indemnities and prevent her commercial restoration or development. This contradiction has left its trail over many of the economic clauses of the Treaty.

An important fact in this connection should be pointed out. While the indemnities would go to the Governments, ultimately to individuals who have suffered; the profits of "captured" trade (on behalf of which we may yet find commercial imperialists ready to sacrifice the reparation funds) would go, not to the Government (*i.e.*, the nation) or necessarily to sufferers by the War, but to individual traders.

(1) See p. 28.

Germany was ready to shoulder an indemnity of five thousand million sterling (the sum mentioned in the Labour Manifesto above referred to). A definitely fixed obligation enabling Germany to prepare her budgets and taxation accordingly is obviously more likely to produce results than an arrangement by which her indebtedness is practically unlimited, and by which Allied Commissions have power to "take what they can get." If the whole budgetary surplus, whatever it is, is likely to be collected by a foreign Commission, the surplus is likely to be small. It is not an encouragement to thrift or industry. There is more than a trace, both in the German and Austrian Treaties, of an attempt to "dodge" the whole reparation problem by passing it on to the Reparation Commissions, and leaving it to some future time when the public will have other preoccupations. One recalls the promises made by the British Government at the time of the Boer War that great contribution to its cost should be made by the Trades Council mine owners. We are still, nearly twenty years later, waiting for the first payment.

As Labour is sincere in its demand for complete reparation, and as it has, unlike commercial profiteers, nothing to gain by the destruction of German trade, it is in favour of allowing Germany as rapidly as possible to reconstitute its industry in order that it may pay its debts; and of making those definite.

This is in keeping with the attitude of French, Belgian, and Italian Labour.

The National Committee of the French General Confederation of Labour voted unanimously (May 27) a resolution protesting :—

"Against the continuation of the economic war, and of an undisguised blockade, seeing that all economic boycott is certain to make it impossible for the defeated countries to face the heavy obligations imposed on them by the treaty, and to bring about the continuance of hostility between nations and of international lack of equilibrium for an indefinite period."

The National Committee of the Belgian Labour Party (see *Le Peuple*, June 5) voted as follows :—

"The Party declares that Germany, which was guilty of the most unjust aggression, owes full reparation for the damage caused through her misdeeds. . . . But it is important that the amount of the indemnity to be paid should be specified without loss of time. The Party cannot permit Germany to be forced under the pretext of reparation to sign a blank cheque, or a commission, on which she will not even be represented, to be intrusted with fixing, at its convenience and without discussion, the amount of the debt and the method of payment, and with exercising an almost dictatorial authority, which would reduce Germany to a form of economic slavery."

General Economic Clauses.

What are the outstanding features of the economic terms of the Treaty?

They may be summarised thus :—

1. The demands made upon Germany are indeterminate, and can in practice be indefinitely extended on the decisions of a Commission on which Germany is not represented. Germany has no guarantee of what may really constitute a discharge of her obligation entitling her to the liberation of her territory.

2. The extent of the demands is such as to punish mainly persons innocent of all war guilt, such as the rising generation (details such as the surrender of milch cows press most hardly upon children).

3. Tariff and Fiscal arrangements are not Reciprocal.

4. They offer no substantial guarantee of economic rights in the matter of raw materials and markets which alone would enable Germany to make adequate reparation.

Some of these features make the Treaty a very great departure from precedent.

The usual Peace Treaty of history opened with a profession that the former enemies desired to live in "peace and amity." It then went on to restore provisionally the old basis of intercourse, the commercial treaties as they stood before the War, rights of consular representation, etc. This Treaty does nothing of the kind. No rights accrue from it to Germans, whether as to tariffs, shipping, and railroad rates, aviation, etc. As things stand, they cannot begin to trade until a whole series of further arrangements is made with each of the Allies. In these negotiations each Ally is free to concede as much or as little as it pleases, to exclude German trade—partly or entirely—or to penalise it in various ways and degrees. The German Government cannot bargain or retaliate, for its hands are tied. It has nothing to refuse. It must, according to the Treaty, grant most favoured nation rates to all the Allies, both as to customs and transport rates. It may even be required to build new railways and canals to accommodate their trade. In return it gains no equivalent rights, *e.g.*, to use the Polish railways for its future trade with Russia, or to use the upper course of the Vistula. The Danube is even placed under a Commission on which German Austria is not represented. It must be recollected that in reconstituting their foreign trade, the Germans must start afresh. All their merchants resident in China, Africa, Turkey, and Allied countries generally have been expelled. This Treaty gives them no right to return. That means that if they can sell or buy at all in these markets, it must be through Allied middlemen. Their exports and imports, since they lose all their shipping, must also pay a toll to foreign shipping rings. In short, they are at the mercy of their competitors, who may choose either to boycott them, or to exploit them. In these conditions German experts reckon that their foreign trade will necessarily be so lamed that about fifteen millions of their population (roughly a quarter) will be unable to earn their bread.

An American critic of the Treaty says :—

"The Treaty gives the Alliance the dictatorship over the industrial system out of which Germany is to pay. This was never stipulated, and is the fundamentally vicious thing in the whole Treaty. By signing away Germany's economic independence, the principle enunciated in the subsequent addresses is torn to shreds: the controls over Germany are not given to the League but to the Big Four, who are free to act on their private interest and discretion.

"The unconditional surrender of German militarism is accompanied by the unconditional surrender of German commerce. But German commerce surrenders not to the League but to English industry. Germany loses her economic independence to her greatest competitor. . . . The Treaty gives France an elastic claim on the surplus of whatever industrial life England allows Germany to have." —(New Republic, May 24.)

Now there should be repeated here what has been said in another connection, namely, that in the application of the Treaty the Allies may show themselves more statesmanlike than the terms themselves; that since neither the peace of the world nor the peoples of the Allied nations will gain anything in the long run by hostile commercial discrimination against Germany and the starvation of her people, those things will not be attempted. But it is unfortunately an unduly optimistic assumption in politics that governments in international affairs will always act in the best interests of their peoples as a whole, unswayed by the special interests of particular commercial groups exercising powerful influence on Commissions and Cabinets; or by national animosities and resent-

ment. The Allies (as Labour at Southport and elsewhere has not failed to point out) had certainly no interest in maintaining the blockade "with rigour," as Mr. Churchill boasted, and in aggravating the condition of famine months after the Armistice was signed. Yet it was done, and has added enormously to the difficulties of the re-establishment of Europe. Economic wars, like military ones, may not pay, but that fact will not prevent the one or the other from taking place. Their profitlessness will only be a deterrent when the futility, from being a fact, comes to be a generally recognised and insisted upon fact, operative in public opinion and politics. It is not possible to pretend that that is the case to-day. Every student of those "general causes" of war upon which Labour has laid so much stress recognises that economic rivalries and discriminations, the monopolistic exploitation of backward countries, the exclusive control of areas containing raw material must be reckoned as among the most potent excitements of international jealousies, intrigue, resentment, rivalry, and war. That is why Labour has always so strenuously condemned economic wars, why, in common with President Wilson, it has always insisted upon the principle of equality of economic opportunity for all nations, upon provisions for access to raw materials, etc.

No such provisions are made in this Treaty. To say that they are not necessary because no nation has any real interest in denying Germany access to raw material is to be guilty of very faulty reasoning from an entirely sound premise. To say that the world has no interest in hampering German industry is a good reason for definitely assuring its needs by international arrangement, as Labour proposes to do; it is a very inadequate reason for leaving Germany at the mercy of its commercial competitors, or those who regard her as their competitor. The very absence of any "self-denying ordinance" or defined obligation on the part of the Allies will make it very much easier for special capitalist interests, advocates of Imperial preference, and so forth, to exploit national animosities and capitalistic avarice to create anew international conditions provocative of war.

Labour's point of view is expressed in the following passage from the Memorandum on War Aims⁽¹⁾ :—

"All attempts at economic aggression, whether by Protective tariffs or Capitalists' Trusts or Monopolies, inevitably result in the spoliation of the working classes of the several countries for the profit of the capitalists; and the working class see in the alliance between Military Imperialists and the Fiscal Protectionists in any country whatsoever not only a serious danger to the prosperity of the masses of the people, but also a grave menace to Peace."

And consequently :—

"The Conference declares against all the projects now being prepared by Imperialists and capitalists, not in any one country only, but in most countries, for an Economic War, after Peace has been secured either against one or other foreign nation or against all foreign nations, as such an Economic War, if begun by any country, would inevitably lead to reprisals to which each nation in turn might in self-defence be driven."

The reasons for Labour's emphasis on the evils of Economic Imperialism as a cause of war are not always sufficiently understood. Yet the logic of it is simple. We give a preference to, say, Indian tea or Egyptian cotton, or Nigerian tobacco, or Canadian wheat. At home

(1) February, 1918.

the corresponding increase of prices must be "compensated for" by a preference accorded to British manufacturers in the Canadian, Egyptian, Indian, or Nigerian markets. From those markets, therefore, "foreigners"—that is to say, the American, Frenchman, Italian, Belgian—are excluded in lesser or greater degree. The British Empire becomes an institution hostile to their interests. Every time it expands they, in their view, lose a market. To forestall that, France must be on the lookout to expand *her* Empire in Africa; Japan hers in China; America hers in Mexico—or Canada. By no possibility could development along this road avoid armament rivalry. It is not, perhaps, intended that it should. Already an Anglo-American Naval rivalry threatens to follow the Naval competition which cursed the world in the years preceding Armageddon. We are already at war with one of our Allies of 1914 (or, at least, if not legally at war with Russia, our ammunition is killing Russians); conflict between another Ally, Italy, and one of the lesser peoples, on behalf of whose independence the war was justified by so many of us, grows every day more likely. If the Treaty renders future peace with the Central Empires impossible, so also must the tendencies of the peace even between the members of the existing Allies permanently be impossible.

These underlying causes of explosion are neither abolished nor lessened by the Treaty. In the case of Germany they are made immeasurably worse.

The facts of the situation should be grasped.

Germany's Economic Position.

The German population was expanding before the war at the rate of considerably over a million a year. The soil of Germany is not rich, and did not before the war furnish food for the population living on it, the country, like England, only in lesser degree, being dependent upon industry and foreign trade for the wherewithal to purchase food. "Iron is bread," as some German economist has put it. The transfer of territory under the Treaty deprives Germany of three-fourths of her iron and much of her coal, and, with her colonies, certain tropical raw materials. Her shipping will have been confiscated. Let us look at these facts in relation to the future security of France, which it is one of our main objects to achieve.

For several generations France has been of stationary, of recent years, indeed, of declining population. It is not a new tendency; remedies have been endlessly discussed in the past with no result; its causes are evidently very deep-seated indeed. The soil of France is among the richest and most varied in the world, producing in the way of wines, brandies, and certain other luxuries, results which can be duplicated nowhere else. It stretches into the sub-tropics. In addition, the country possesses a vast colonial empire—in Algeria, Tunis, Morocco (which include some of the greatest food-growing areas in the world), Madagascar, Equatorial Africa, Cochin-China, an Empire managed, by the way, on strongly protectionist principles.

We have thus, on the one side a people of forty millions with no tendency to increase, mainly non-industrial (because not needing to be), possessing undeveloped areas capable, in their food and mineral resources (home and colonial), of supporting a population very many times its size. On the other hand, is a neighbouring group, very much larger and rapidly increasing (race suicide not having yet set in), occupying a

poorer and smaller territory, and unable to subsist at modern standards on that territory without a highly developed industry, of the essential raw materials of which the smaller group has deprived it, and may, on grounds of self-defence, fearing to be outnumbered, withhold.

How can such settlement affect the future operation of the underlying causes which led to the war? We know that pre-eminent among these causes was the indoctrination of a whole people with a certain theory of life in the world; so that the welfare and survival of nations depends upon their power to seize the means of subsistence; war is part of the inevitable struggle for life in the world, the pressure of population upon subsistence; nations can only provide for their increasing populations by expanding their territory; "biological need," "struggle for bread," and so forth.

It was a false doctrine, as Germany's own success in feeding a vastly increased population by virtue of industrial co-operation with peoples over whom she exercised no political dominion proved. She was feeding growing millions without conquest or extension of territory. The degree of freedom in economic movement which had already come to be recognised as part of the established comity of nations before the war, made it unnecessary for a country to "own" the sources of its raw material as it is for Lancashire to "own" Louisiana, although that foreign State is the source of the raw material of one of England's greatest industries, and the basis of livelihood for millions of English workers. There had already come about a degree of economic interdependence which made the theory of rival economic nationalism essentially false. The needs of all could have been met without sacrifice of vital interest on either side by consciously organised co-operation. And those most concerned—the workers—had so far realised this as to stand in their policies for a fraternal internationalism. Although special groups may have benefited by economic imperialism—as doubtless special groups will benefit by the imperial or colonial protectionism of Britain or France if ever that policy is enforced—the great rising popular parties, Labour, Radical, and Socialist, had repudiated on behalf of the mass of the people any economic interest in conquest.

The Allies were in an ultimate sense right when (May 22), replying to the criticism that transfers of territory deprive Germany of the basis of a large portion of her industry, they say :—

"It would appear to be a fundamental fallacy that the political control of a country is essential in order to procure a reasonable share of its products. Such a proposal finds no foundation in economic law or in history."

But several facts should be noted with reference to this theory that political control of territories containing raw material is of small consequence to a nation's industry. The first, very much insisted upon by the school most notable in defending the theory, is that it only holds good fully if we can assume that a people in occupation of territory containing sources of raw material will in the long run be guided by that people's own best interest and not sacrifice it to the deliberate object of injuring a foreign nation for political reasons. If, as a deliberate part of policy, any of the Allies, even minor States like Poland or Czecho-Slovakia, should in future deny German access to necessary minerals; or if other Allies should deny access to the raw materials of Algeria, Morocco, Tunis, Equatorial Africa; if the growing power of Preferential Imperialists within the British Empire should result in with-

holding the raw materials of the rest of Africa—including Egypt—of India, Mesopotamia (or necessary coal for ships), from the future inhabitants of Germany, present and future, that country will have no recourse under the Treaty.

Secondly, although this doctrine that the political control of territory containing raw materials is essential to a nation's prosperity may be a fallacy, as the Allied note says, it is a fallacy to which the Allies themselves very readily subscribed on occasion. When Germany pointed out that France could have the coal of the Saar Valley, without political control over the population, M. Clemenceau, for the same Powers who two days previously (May 22) denounced the fundamental fallacy, said; "In particular I would point out that no arrangement of the kind put forward would give to France the security and certainty which she would receive from the full exploitation and free ownership of the mines of the Saar."

And what of Persian oil, loans in China, enterprises in Morocco, Mesopotamia; of Italian desire for coal mines in Turkey; of the quarrels between Czechs and Poles over Teschen coal mines—and numberless similar cases the world over?

There is a further point. The changes in political sovereignty wrought by the great wars of Europe during the last few centuries have not, as a rule, involved any disturbance of the titles to private property. This War marks a very great departure in that respect. Coal and iron mines, and other properties, have been taken over by the new political administration, leaving the defeated Government to indemnify former owners. In other words, there has been widespread confiscation by the conqueror. This is a departure from past practice more fundamental than we seem to realise. Even under feudalism the means of subsistence of the people, the land they cultivated, as whole, remained as before. Only the lords were changed—and one lord was very like another. But where, under the modern industrial economy, titles to property in indispensable raw materials can be cancelled by a conqueror, and become the State property of the conquering nation which enforces the right to distribute them as it pleases, whole populations may find themselves deprived of the actual means of supporting themselves on the territory that they occupy. Lancashire starved for want of cotton; Westphalia may well starve for want of iron.

It is possible at least to imagine such a development of this tendency that "the fundamental fallacy" of the Allied note may become by no means a fallacy; that what was false before the war, will be true after. The militarist theories which before were evil errors will have become monstrous truths.

Be that as it may. The truth is that the world as a whole does not accept the Allied doctrine of May 22; it accepts that of May 24. "It is not the facts but men's opinions about the facts" that make political situations. If one side is entitled to demand the political control as a necessary security for access to raw material, the other is in justice entitled to demand the security by Treaty right definitely formulated. That involves an international system or Code of Rights, under which security, fair treatment, and economic opportunity will be ensured to all peoples, whatever the political limits of their State. This neither the Treaty nor the League accomplishes; nor, indeed, does it take the first indispensable steps thereto. While the repressive and pro-

hibitory conditions of the Treaty are exceedingly severe, and while the Covenant of the League which is embodied in it provides elaborately for plans of coercion if its authority should be challenged, neither the one nor the other makes provision for assuring the economic future or the political rights of the countries against which they are in fact directed. The Treaty sets up no rule of international conduct, the observance of which will entitle the German population to any proportionate participation in the resources of the world; it contains no undertaking that future good behaviour will win that privilege; it embodies no Bill of Rights.

Yet precisely this constructive Code of Rights was amongst the most definite of the declarations of policy made by President Wilson. The third of the Fourteen Points demanded (a) equality of trade conditions among all the nations consenting to the Peace, and (b) the removal, as far as possible, of all economic barriers.

The following are other declarations to the same effect :—

“Peace should rest upon the rights of people . . . their equal rights to . . . a participation upon fair terms in the economic opportunities of the world, the German people, of course, included.” (Reply to Pope.)

“It has come about in the altered world in which we now find ourselves that justice and the rights of peoples affect the whole field of international dealing as much as access to raw materials and equal conditions of trade. . . . Separate and selfish compacts with regard to trade and the essential materials of manufacture would afford no foundation for peace.” (February 11, 1918.)

“With a right comity of arrangement no nation need be shut away from the free access to the open paths of the world's commerce.” (January 22, 1917.)

“The principle of public right must henceforth take precedence over the individual interests of particular nations. . . . We are willing . . . to limit ourselves along with others to a prescribed course of duty and respect for the rights of others.” (May 27, 1916.)

End of Laissez-Faire.

Labour has recognised that for effect to be given to the principle of equality here indicated, it will be quite inadequate merely to restore laissez-faire and individual scramble in the matter of trade in raw materials. That era has passed as much for nations as for private traders.

The Resolution of the Berne Conference concerning the League of Nations included the following :—

“The League of Nations should have powers which will enable it to develop into an organ controlling the production and distribution of foodstuffs and raw materials throughout the world, with a view to the raising of that production and distribution to the highest degree of efficiency.”

This Resolution is of course in keeping with the general decision arrived at by the Inter-Allied Conference on War Aims of February 25, 1917. The memorandum there passed under the head of Economic Relations agreed, after urging the importance of the principle of the open door and the absence of hostile discrimination against foreign countries, the following :—

“In view of the probable world-wide shortage after the war of exportable foodstuffs and raw material and of merchant shipping, it is imperative in order to prevent the most serious hardships, and even possible famine, in one country or another, that systematic arrangement should be made on an international basis, for the allocation and conveyance of the available exportable surpluses of these commodities to the different countries, in proportion, not to their purchasing powers, but to their several pressing needs; and that within each country the Government must for some time maintain its control of the most indispensable commodities in

order to secure their proportion, not in competitive market mainly to the richer classes in proportion to their means, but, systematically, to meet the most urgent needs of the whole community: 'no cake for anyone until all have bread.'"

The foregoing is, of course, equivalent to the demand that certain of the international controls over shipping, the distribution and price fixing of foodstuffs and raw materials, the furnishing of credit, established during the War by the various Allied Governments and exercised through the Inter-Allied Commissions, should be continued. While it is true that these bodies have during the War been little subject to democratic control, they can for peace purposes be rendered accessible to working class and Trades Union representation, and could of course be made truly international in character by the inclusion of representatives of neutrals.

The Memorandum published by the Labour Party on "International Labour Legislation" has (p. 29) the following:—

For the emergency period at least, it is vitally necessary that from the supreme Economic Council of the Allies should emerge a World Economic Council with the function of rationing the nations with supplies while the world shortage and dislocation of normal trade conditions continue. This is essential, not only because both raw materials and foodstuffs and the tonnage necessary for their transport are largely in the hands of Great Britain and the United States, but also because purchasing power and credit are largely concentrated in the same hands. There can be no speedy restoration of the world's economic life unless supplies and the credit necessary to obtain them are placed freely at the disposal of all nations. Failure to do this, which will mean a scramble for supplies between the nations, coupled with a stagnation in most of the markets of the world, even where the need for supplies is greatest, would merely ensure the perpetuation of old economic antagonisms between the nations and the rapid creation of new ones, even among the countries at present in alliance. This would clearly be fatal to every possible hope of a real League of Nations.

The principle here indicated is fully supported by French Labour. The National Committee of the French General Confederation of Labour voted unanimously (May 27) the following:—

The National Committee protests against the absence of an international economic organisation whose duty it will be to secure the distribution and transport of raw materials.

At a time when there is a world-wide deficit, when needs and demands exceed supplies of products necessary to the restoration of normal collective life, the creation of an international organisation for distribution was indispensable. By permitting the maintenance of competition, at the present time, between nations unequally affected by the war, certain of these are placed in an obviously inferior position, and it is to be feared that the constitution of a commercial imperialism will be added to the dangers of an as yet undestroyed militarism.

The workers cannot accept that certain nations should enjoy a surfeit of material wealth while others are plunged in poverty.

The bearing of such a policy upon the objects aimed at in the International Labour Charter is obvious.

International regulation of Labour conditions must be largely ineffective if the control of transport, of the distribution of food and raw materials is left in the hands of vast capitalist organisations working outside Government or popular control, managed by private capitalists for the purpose of profiteering. Experience of the past shows that in any case there will be international arrangements of some kind in such things as shipping and the great staple industries. If such international organisation is not under public control it will be formed under the control of private capital. In the latter case it will be possible for capitalist organisations to wreck any industrial enterprise—wherever

established—into which has been introduced a degree of Trade Unionism, Socialism, or Syndicalism that Capitalism may consider dangerous.

It is obvious, therefore, that the policy of Labour towards the international regulation and controls worked by the Governments for the purpose of the war is that these bodies should not be simply and purely abolished, but that their defects should be remedied and their functions enlarged and democratised for the purpose of peace. These bodies, however autocratic and bourgeois in character during the war, constitute the beginnings of an organised economic Government of the world, an international control that may be made the basis of valuable international sanctions. They represent at least a departure in principle from the old order of individual competition in favour of one of international co-operation on a basis of real need and common welfare. They should be made the beginnings of a constructive international society.

Labour's Concern in the Famine.

All these points were again emphasised in the Resolution on the Blockade voted at the Annual Labour Party Conference at Southport in these terms:

"This Conference enters its emphatic protest against the method of starvation, especially when used against women and children, as an instrument of government policy, and views with grave anxiety the effects of the blockade on Central Europe in bringing the horrors of famine upon the great masses of the population in those countries. It protests further against the failure to provide in the Peace Treaty either for the restoration of industry throughout Europe with equality of fiscal treatment, or for any adequate international control of raw materials and food. It urges that the administration of the Supreme Economic Council dealing with the distribution of raw materials and food supplies, and the management of finance, should be made more democratic by the inclusion of representatives of the international working-class movement; and that full publicity be given to its proceedings."

The Labour Committee of the "Save the Children Fund" issues a brief statement bringing out Labour's concern in the famine and the ineffectiveness of the mere raising of the blockade. It says:—

The famine that now rages will not be stopped by "permitting the importation of food" if, at the moment of granting that permission we take away the only means of getting food, the means of paying for it, or of transporting it. Without ships, or rolling stock, or iron, or coal, or needed raw material it will be impossible for Central Europe to grapple with the famine. There are such losses the world over to make up that nothing but normal conditions and getting back to work will suffice. *The Treaty won't ensure that unless you insist.*

The Treaty places Germany's foreign trade, and even her internal industry in the hands of her commercial Capitalist competitors. It is her trade rivals who will decide the amount of food, raw material, shipping, credit, she is to receive.

There are powerful influences at work that will try and use the economic clauses of the Treaty to prevent, in the interests of "trade rivalry," the re-establishment of industry in Central Europe—the only thing which now can stop the famine. And however Capitalism may profit by the starvation of Germany, Labour will lose. For famine will mean:—

(1) *Reduction, or extinction, of Restitution or Indemnity.*

Mr. Hoover (June 9, 1919) points out :—

“Of the 70 millions of Germans, some 25 or 30 millions lived before the war by trade, by the import of raw material, and by exports in exchange for food and other necessities, and these cannot be supported on the land. How they will pay the indemnity and at the same time secure credits for raw materials is the problem for the Commission. . . . If they do not get raw material and food they will never be able to pay the indemnities.”

(2) *Reduction in the standard of living for the workers throughout half of Europe:* Obviously.

(3) *The forced emigration of millions of workers into the more fortunate areas.*

Mr. Hoover says: “One possibility that must not be overlooked is that 10 or 12 millions of this (German) population may emigrate eastward or overseas under the economic pressure which will be their fate at best.”

(4) *Servile conditions of Labour in large areas.*

In the transfer of territories, especially mining areas contemplated in the Treaty, great numbers of workmen will be placed under the control of alien governors enforcing an alien rule, and so compelled to employ “stern” measures of order—threatened by famine.

(5) *Economic discrimination against Socialist or Workers’ Governments.*

The measures taken by great organisations—necessarily under capitalistic influence—for controlling and limiting Germany’s trade, industry, shipping and finance, will also be used, unless held in check by Labour influence, for discriminating against Governments that attempt to give Labour a larger share of the products of industry or to increase its part of control. Where shortage is severe the “undeserving” are apt to be left out.

(6) *Greatly increased difficulties in the international co-operation of Labour throughout the world.*

Should British workers acquiesce in measures involving the starvation of those in Germany who are now attempting to establish a democratic Republic, or those in Hungary who have already established an orderly workers’ Republic, the faith of these nascent democracies in the possibility of future co-operation with the western democracies will have been utterly shattered. German militarists would not fail to point out that a disarmed German Republic was being treated by British workmen as badly as any autocratic Germany could be treated; that all the promises of reconciliation and co-operation, if only Germany would change her system, had proved an illusion. The parties who stood for military power as the only means by which the country could secure the right even to feed its population would inevitably gain in influence. This would mean, ultimately.

(7) *Counter-revolution and the revival of militarism in Central Europe—and thus everywhere.*

CHAPTER IV.

BOUNDARIES OF GERMANY AND GERMAN-AUSTRIA.

In what respects the changes of frontier violate the principle of nationality and the right of all peoples to means of subsistence. The unsatisfactory nature of the plebiscites. The violation of the rights of German Austrians.

The Berne Conference protested against :—

1. *The right of the victor to the spoils of war, and all the agreements whereby States have been drawn into the war by the promise of an increase of territory at the expense of other nations.*

2. *The determination of frontiers according to strategical interests.*
3. *Forced or veiled annexations on the ground of so-called historic rights or of alleged economic necessities.*
4. *The recognition of "faits accomplis" by the military occupation of disputed territories.*
5. *The establishment of any economic or political sphere of influence.*

The Allied Memorandum on War Aims (February, 1918) states:—

The new Treaty of Peace, in recognising that Germany, by her declaration of war of 1914, has herself broken the Treaty of Frankfort, will make null and void the gains of a brutal conquest and of the violence committed against the people.

France, having secured this recognition, can properly agree to a fresh consultation of the population of Alsace and Lorraine as to its own desires.

The Treaty of Peace will bear the signatures of every nation in the world. It will be guaranteed by the League of Nations. To this League of Nations France is prepared to remit, with the freedom and integrity of a popular vote, of which the details can be subsequently settled, the organisation of such a consultation as shall settle for ever, as a matter of right, the future destiny of Alsace and Lorraine, and as shall finally remove from the common life of all Europe a quarrel which has imposed so heavy a burden upon it.

Alsace-Lorraine is handed back to France without consultation of her population, without effective guarantee of the private rights of remaining German citizens; without any provision (such as that which is made in favour of France should the Saar Valley return finally to Germany) for German access to iron-ore fields which have heretofore furnished two-thirds of the ore required by German industry. German-Austria is not to be free to unify herself with the main German stock, although she is now a little State of six millions, which cannot be economically self-supporting, and has by a unanimous vote of its Reichstat, confirmed in the February elections, declared for union with Germany. This is vetoed by the Treaty.

The German districts of Czecho-Slovakia are (by arrangements which Germany is compelled to agree to beforehand) refused the right of self-determination; a similar refusal is made in the case of the Germans of the Austrian Tyrol. Together they form a population as large as that of Ireland. If to those we add the German districts that go to Poland we get a German "irredentist" population several times as great as the population of Alsace-Lorraine, whose separation from France was so large a factor in preventing, during half a century, the establishment of European peace.

Where plebiscites are granted they are to be under the management of a Commission appointed by the Allies, as are also the regulations giving East Prussia access to and use of the Vistula, and not under the League of Nations or Commissions on which Germany is represented. The purely German city of Dantzic is placed under the guarantee of the League of Nations, but is controlled in its customs and foreign affairs by Poland. For 15 years territory West of the Rhine is placed under foreign occupation, the termination of which is subject to the fulfilment of the Treaty, which many regard as quite impossible to fulfil, an occupation which places for nearly a generation under alien military rule a large section of a people now struggling towards republicanism, democracy, and Socialism.

These items demand some expansion.

The Saar Valley.

It is true that in the final treaty some of the provisions of the draft treaty against which the Joint Manifesto of the National Executive and the Parliamentary Labour Party (June 5) protested, have been amended. But the remaining provisions still justify the objections made in the Manifesto to even a provisional cession of the territory.⁽¹⁾ The German Government has no representation on the Commission which will administer the territory; the French Government or a French Syndicate will be the sole employer in the chief industry of the territory, and can import foreign labour at its discretion; is to have the right of establishing schools and of imposing the French language therein; and of creating charitable institutions. And finally, although the Treaty provides that those resident in the territory at the date of the Treaty may have the right to vote, it does not provide that no one else shall. These facts should be considered in conjunction with certain features which are already characterising the military occupation of the Left Bank of the Rhine.⁽²⁾

The protest of the French "General Confederation of Labour" against this feature of the Treaty is particularly notable. The National Committee of the Confederation, on May 27, voted unanimously the following resolution:—

"As regards the Saar Valley, the National Committee denounces the economical and political disputes, which cannot fail to arise between the workers in this district and the authorities in occupation. The French workers owe it to themselves to protest against the slavery which the workers will have to endure when under a Government about which they have not been consulted."

Danzig, West Prussia and Poland.

The Joint Manifesto of the National Executive of the Labour Party and the Parliamentary Labour Party says:—

"In the delimitation of the frontiers of the new Polish State violence is done to the right of the people to determine their national allegiance. Thus, there is a contravention of President Wilson's 'Thirteenth Point,' which lays it down that the new Polish State should only contain genuinely Polish elements."

The Permanent Commission of the International (Amsterdam, 1919) passed the following Resolution:—

It is important to reject all proposals to take from Germany territory, forming part of the Eastern and Western provinces of Prussia and inhabited by Germans, in order to cede it to the Polish State, with the object of giving the latter access to the Baltic Sea.

The River Vistula affords the Polish State free and assured access to the sea by the conversion of the German town of Danzig, where two per cent. of the inhabitants are Polish, into a free port under the control of the League of Nations.

The Manifesto of the Committee of Action of the Berne Labour and Socialist International (Paris, 11th May) says:—

"In drawing the boundaries of the new Polish State (the creation of which the Committee welcomes) violence is done to the right of people to choose their

(1) The Manifesto said:—

"The Draft Treaty cedes to France 'full ownership of the coal mines in the Saar Basin.' The terms of the armistice never so much as hinted at such a possibility. France should undoubtedly receive from Germany a sufficient supply of coal to compensate her for the temporary loss of her own mining resources. This claim can be met without handing over the population of the Saar districts even to a neutral administration."

(2) See pp. 50-52.

political allegiance. The division of the German State into two separate parts is dangerous, and will remain a source of trouble and ill-will."

The National Committee of the Belgian Labour Party (see *Le Peuple*, June 5) voted the following:—

"By incorporating within a 'Greater Poland' numerous German, Lithuanian, and Ukrainian population, the right of self-determination of the peoples is directly violated, and future peace is seriously endangered. The Party demands that only unquestionably Polish populations should be included in the new State; its right to free access to the sea being fully recognised."

The Treaty assigns to Poland nearly the whole of West Prussia, thus cutting off East Prussia from the rest of Germany and placing nearly a million Germans of West Prussia under Polish rule. The population of West Prussia is over 1½ millions, of whom only about 500,000 are Poles, who inhabit a narrow strip of land adjoining the River Vistula. The Treaty provides for no plebiscite in West Prussia nor for any other method of consulting the desire of the people concerned, for the obvious reason that if the desire of the people concerned were consulted, West Prussia would remain German.

The only reason which has been alleged for this annexation is the further provisions in the 13th point that Poland "should be assured a free and secure access to the sea." But access to the sea cannot be assured by annexing territory in West Prussia, inhabited by Germans; it can only be assured by the opening of the River Vistula to free navigation. In other words, Poland's free and secure access to the sea could have been assured by making Danzig a free port and by internationalising a free right of way down the Vistula to Danzig under the guarantee of the League of Nations.

The terms now dictated to Germany profess to create a "Free City of Danzig" under the guarantee of the League of Nations. In effect, Danzig is handed over to Poland, for the City is included within the Customs frontiers of Poland, the administration of its railways, postal, telegraphic, and telephonic communications is given to Poland, and its diplomatic and foreign relations are handed over to Poland. Yet Danzig is a German city, and if the desire of the people of Danzig was consulted, in any way whatever, they would by an overwhelming majority elect to remain within the frontiers of Germany.

Upper Silesia.

Point 13 demands that "an independent Polish State should be erected, which should include the territories inhabited by indisputably Polish populations," and this was substantially supported by the Inter-Allied War Aims Memorandum.

The arrangement under which Upper Silesia is ceded to Poland, obviously aims less at applying to that region the principle of self-determination than at depriving Germany of mineral assets. The Treaty hands over to Poland various towns and districts like Oppeln, Ratibor, etc., lying on the border of the proposed frontier, the German character of which has never been questioned. It is true that in the revised Treaty provision is made for plebiscite. The plebiscite, however, is under the control of a Commission composed solely of Allied representatives, and may be taken eighteen months after evacuation by German authorities. There is, moreover, attached to the plebiscite a condition of especial interest to Labour. When the Allies take over the control of the province during the interim period, not only are German officials to disappear (a proper provision), but the Workers' Councils are to be dissolved and

their members "evacuated." These Workers' Councils exercise no governing functions. They are simply trades councils representing the working class. Their members in a dense mining and industrial area like Upper Silesia are certain to be numerous, and may total many hundreds of men. The intention of this condition is obvious. Germany has a prospect of winning this plebiscite only if the organised working class considers that its lot will be happier in semi-Socialist Germany than in decidedly anti-Socialist Poland. Therefore, the Poles demand that all the elected leaders of the organised workmen shall be expelled while the vote is under consideration. A plebiscite ought to be taken without pressure, but certainly not without argument and advice from the natural leaders of those most affected.

Malmedy and Eupen.

The National Committee of the Belgian Labour Party (see *Le Peuple*, June 5) has voted the following :—

"The Party warmly welcomes into the Belgian family the Malmedy Walloons who wish to join us of their own free will. But it does not acquiesce in the annexation of German populations against their will. It demands that the referendum anticipated for the cantons of Malmedy and Eupen should have bona fide guarantees, and especially that the voting should be obligatory, secret, and organised in such a way that the votes in each district should be counted separately."

German-Austria.

The National Executive of the Labour Party in the Manifesto of May 8th state :—

"In accordance with the principle of self-determination, the people of German-Austria should have free and unrestricted right to decide for themselves whether they will become one of the Federal States of Germany or remain independent; any other solution would be an act of injustice and repression of national impulses that may imperil the peace of Europe."

The Amsterdam International (April 26) passed the following :—

"The International Conference recognises that while Imperial Austria, whose régime was based upon violence, was still powerful, the Social Democracy of German-Austria fought for the freedom and self-determination of peoples against its own capitalist classes. To-day, therefore, the Socialists of German-Austria may claim for themselves the right of self-government, which in conformity with President Wilson's programme, belongs to every nation."

"German-Austria has the right to determine for itself to which State or Nation it wishes to be united, and above all it has the right to refuse to be subjected, against its will, to another people."

"It has the absolute right either to preserve its independence, or, as the majority of the population now demands, to unite the whole of its Austro-German territories to Germany, and to oppose every attempt at separating national homogeneous territories against the will of the populations. The Conference refuses to recognise historic or any other claims of alien nations to sovereignty over such homogeneous German districts or districts which form a geographical unity with German-speaking districts."

"The rights of minorities in such districts should be determined by agreement and guaranteed internationally."

"The Conference protests, with the Austrian Socialists, against the efforts of those who desire to anticipate the final decisions of the Peace Conference by the military occupation of German-Austrian territory."

It will be seen, from the facts already summarised, that both the Treaty with Germany and that with Austria violate these conditions: German-Austria is denied self-determination and necessary freedom for its economic life; German-Austrians are placed under alien rule.

CHAPTER V.

COLONIES.

The failure of the Treaty to make provision against the colonial question becoming the cause of future wars in the economic conflicts for raw materials. The inadequacy of the mandatory system.

Early in the war (October 2, 1914, at Cardiff) Mr. Asquith, outlining British aims, said :—

We do not covet any peoples' territory. We have no desire to press our rule upon alien populations. The British Empire is enough for us. All we wish for now is to be allowed peaceably to consolidate our resources. . . . We have no desire to add to our imperial territories over any area or any responsibility.

The German allegation, of course, was that the British Empire intended to enrich itself territorially at the expense of its enemies.

Eight hundred thousand square miles of territory have been added to the Empire—not without creating jealousies, even among our Allies.

The *Avanti* of May 29 publishes the following Resolution, voted by the Italian Parliamentary Socialist Party (41 deputies) :—

In conformity with the imperialistic nature of this war of victory, the Treaty distributes the territorial, colonial and financial spoils, according to the naval and military superiority of the victorious States, and not according to their needs, thus realising within the alliance itself the hierarchic law of capitalism, according to which the rich become richer, and the poor poorer, with the certain result of the loss of all liberty for the latter and of the creation of deadly enmities, which will be another powerful cause of war.

The National Council of the Belgian Labour (see *Le Peuple*, June 5) voted the following :—

The party cannot admit the right of the Great Powers, as mere victors, to appropriate the German Colonies. Determined to claim the guarantee of international control for colonial populations, it protests vigorously against the system which assigns them to the strongest as spoils of war and as profitable chattels.

Further, it considers that a dangerous and untenable situation would be created in Europe, by depriving an industrial country, whether Germany or any other, of colonial raw materials and colonial markets.

The National Committee of the French General Confederation of Labour voted (May 27) as follows :—

Against the continuation of colonialism, another source of conflict, and against the absence of all international regulation concerning the administration of colonies unfit to govern themselves.

The solution of the colonial problem, which has in the past instituted a grave element of discord, can only be found in the internationalisation of the exploitation of the natural wealth of new countries, which is indispensable to post-war economic activity, and in the training of the enslaved natives to lead a free and modern life. The handing over of the German Colonies to certain countries, even under cover of a mandate of the League, in no way corresponds to this solution.

Moreover, it is nothing but annexation, which is scarcely even veiled, and in which the interests of the natives have not been taken into consideration.

The National Executive of the British Labour Party in their Manifesto of May 8 state :—

"As the war was partly the product of frustrated colonial ambitions, and the Treaty makes no provision for equality of trade conditions for all the nations consenting to the peace, any permanent denial to Germany of the opportunity to become a mandatory under the League of Nations must be a cause of jealousy and unrest, leading to further international strife, whilst the increase of colonial territories under allied control will involve a corresponding increase of naval, military and administrative burdens upon the allied peoples."

The Manifesto of the Committee of Action of the Berne Labour and Socialist international states:—

"The disposal of the German Colonies and the denial of a mandate by the League of Nations will be universally regarded as nothing more nor less than Imperialism satisfying itself with the spoils of war."

Labour has had a very clearly defined policy in certain particulars with reference to the Colonial questions in the Peace Settlement.

The Memorandum on War Aims (February, 1918) demands:—

"The Treaty of Peace . . . must secure economic equality in such territories (colonies taken from any belligerent) for the peoples of all nations, and thereby guarantee that none is shut out from legitimate access to raw materials, prevented from disposing of its own products, or deprived of its proper share of economic development."

"As regards more especially the colonies of all the belligerents in Tropical Africa, from sea to sea, including the whole of the region north of the Zambesi and south of the Sahara, the Conference condemns any imperialist idea which would make these countries the booty of one or several nations, exploit them for the profit of capitalist, or use them for the promotion of the militarist aims of the Governments."

"With respect to these colonies, the Conference declares in favour of a system of control established by international agreement under the League of Nations and maintained by its guarantee, which, whilst respecting national sovereignty, would be alike inspired by broad conceptions of economic freedom and concerned to safeguard the rights of the natives under the best conditions possible for them, and in particular:—

- 1. It would take account in each locality of the wishes of the people expressed in the form which is possible to them.*
- 2. The interests of the native tribes as regards the ownership of the soil would be maintained.*
- 3. The whole of the revenues would be devoted to the well-being and development of the colonies themselves."*

The Permanent Commission of the Labour and Socialist International (April 28) passed the following:—

"The International Conference . . . welcomes the introduction in the Covenant of the League of Nations, of the idea that peoples unable to stand on their own feet should be placed as wards under the protection of the more advanced States that are in a position to exercise the responsibility. It reiterates, however, the proposals for amendment which it has made and brought before the Chairman of the League of Nations Commission in Paris, as follows:—

- 1. That all colonies and dependencies as above defined, and not merely German Colonies, should be so treated;*
- 2. That the mandates should not be assigned until the League of Nations is fully representative of the democratic nations;*
- 3. That every mandate issued should be definite in the responsibilities it imposes on the mandatory power and safeguard to the utmost the rights of the protected peoples including those of training towards the exercise of self-government."*

The Conference further declares that the economic opportunities should be open to all nations equally.

No provision is made in the Treaty in order to prevent the application in the recently conquered African colonies of the same policy of preference, exploitation and exclusion which certain powers have heretofore adopted in Africa. And even if we assume that certain of the former German colonies will come under the mandatory system, the open door will be more than counterbalanced by the closed door of Morocco, in which territory not only Germany but other countries lose international rights as soon as Morocco becomes a French Protectorate.

In the early period of the War, British Statesmen—notably Mr. Asquith in his Dublin speech—emphasised Britain's territorial dis-

interestedness. They declared that Britain's "Imperial responsibilities" were heavy enough already, all that she could bear, and so forth. As the result of the War, however, immense areas have been added to the British Empire—added either undisguisedly, as in the case of the German colonies annexed by Australia, New Zealand, and South Africa—and in somewhat thin disguise as in the case of the "mandatory" territories.

It will be noted that though those mandates are to be held under the League of Nations, the League of Nations has had nothing to do in assigning them. The Allies have assigned the mandates to themselves. A greater air of impartiality, to say the least, would have been given to the transaction if the burden of Empire had been a little more evenly distributed by giving some mandates to neutral States (Switzerland and the Scandinavian States have furnished admirable administrators in certain cases in the past where international control has been advisable).

This assignment of mandates by the Allies to themselves synchronises with a recrudescence of Protectionism and Imperial Preference in England. Persistent efforts will certainly be made by all the special interests concerned to work up sentiment on behalf of a self-contained Empire. Already we have an export duty upon African palm nuts (the raw material of margarine, soap, oil, cake, and other articles) designed to favour British at the expense of foreign manufacturers. Certain Indian products like jute are, in practice, placed in the same position. The list is likely soon to be added to. This cannot fail to create those tariff wars and wrangles against which Labour has so repeatedly protested. At the moment when the British Empire includes something like a quarter of the earth's surface, anti-foreign prejudice leading to policies of exclusion seems to be taking a firmer hold than ever. Yet unless with increase of territory and power goes an increase in the sense of responsibility to mankind as a whole, our Empire may end by becoming, as world empires have been before, a menace to the freedom and welfare of mankind.

CHAPTER VI.

CHINA.

Japanese imperialism in China and the protests of the Chinese Delegates.

The cession to Japan of the province of Shantung is so flagrant a violation of the rights of the Chinese population of forty millions that it has been the occasion of China's withdrawal from the Conference. This clause is the culmination of the arrangements by which the Allies make themselves the sponsors of Japanese claims in China; a very cynical violation of all the declarations against Imperialism and conquest, the "handing over of people as though they were pawns," etc., etc.

The Manifesto of the Committee of Action of the Berne Labour and Socialist International states:—

"Nor must the callous handing over of the Shantung Peninsula, with all its resources, and the transference of from 30,000,000 to 40,000,000 Chinese to Japanese

economic control, be passed over in silence, as it is a frank recognition of the right of conquest."

The Chinese National Defence League in Europe published a protestation against the China-Japanese arrangements in the following terms :—

"They were concluded without the *bonâ-fide* acquiescence of the Chinese people, and extorted by duress . . .

"The treaties in question are inconsistent with the very existence of China as a sovereign state . . .

"It will create a dangerous precedent in international law and morality if these treaties are to remain in force. No permanent peace can be hoped for as a result of the formation of a League of Nations so long as these monstrous treaties are not repealed or set aside. Referring to the abrogation of inequitable treaties, Woolsey says: "The only tribunal in the case is the moral indignation of mankind." Again, Hall states: "The requirement, that contracts shall be in conformity with law, invalidates, or at least renders voidable, all agreements which are at variance with the fundamental principles of International Law and their undisputed application."

"That the Treaties of 1915 (like those of Bucharest and Brest-Litovsk) have been condemned by the whole civilised world, amounts to being condemned by the 'Moral indignation of Mankind.' Moreover, by breaking the pledges which she gave to England, America, France, and Russia, by putting the immoral methods of Germany into practice in order to filch concessions and rights to which she is not entitled from China, by attempting to make China her vassal state; by taking unfair advantage of China's transitional period of reform while other countries are preoccupied, and further, by reviving the oppressive 'Sphere of Influence,' and by adopting the policy of implantation and exploitation in China, Japan has rendered these Treaties illegal, for they are in direct opposition to the fundamental principles of International Law and its application."

The Chinese have taken the only means open to them of protesting against what are, perhaps, the most cynical articles in the Treaty. Japan has followed a policy of unblushing Imperialism, and while she may plead that she learned that lesson from her Western Allies, the pupil has shown remarkable aptitude. When Japan entered the war, she gave solemn assurances that she had taken up arms only in order to restore to China what Germany unlawfully took from her. That promise she has quietly ignored, and under a secret pact with her, her Allies have allowed her to ignore it. Worse than that, she has exacted from China an immense list of economic concessions, which virtually reduce her to a Japanese sphere of influence. These were justified at the time as payment by China for the service which Japan rendered her in freeing Shantung from German occupation. In the end she has pocketed this extravagant payment, while keeping for herself the port of Kiaochow and all the onerous German economic privileges in the province of Shantung.

The Western Allies come disgracefully out of this transaction. They persuaded China to come into the War as an ally, against Japan's wish. It was represented to China that in this way she would gain a status at the Peace Conference, and secure their support for her just rights. She did what was asked of her. In particular, she declared war on the Germans, wound up all their businesses on her territory, and expelled all Germans resident in China. This was of course a direct service to Allied commerce. German trade with China was torn up by the roots, and Germany's competitors, in particular the British, are thereby (on a short view) the gainers. China, however, has placed herself economically more than ever in our power. Her reward has been that when it came to the point at Paris, the whole Allied world

backed the purely predatory demands of Japan. Even on the narrowest egoistical ground it would be interesting to know what we have gained by substituting Japanese ascendancy in China for Japanese-German competition. Morally, we have become accomplices in one of the most odious bits of Machiavellianism in all the dealings of West with East.

CHAPTER VII.

MILITARY AND NAVAL DISARMAMENT: GUARANTEES.

The disarmament clauses of the Treaty entirely one-sided: no general disarmament. The significance of the Rhineland Republic movement. What a fifteen years' occupation may involve. Militarist activity among the Allies.

The disarmament clauses of the Treaty are entirely one-sided. While conscription is abolished in Germany and Austria, and the German Army reduced to 100,000 men, most, if not all, the Allies retain conscription. The Poles and the Tchechs with a quarter of Germany's population will each retain larger armies than hers. Her fleet disappears. Ours is not reduced. That of America is probably to be increased.

Clause XIV. of the Treaty (Guarantees) contemplates a fifteen years' occupation of the German territory West of the Rhine, with a possible further indefinite period of occupation if, as is inevitable, Germany fails to carry out in full the terms of the Treaty. This Clause, while it does not literally violate any single phrase either of the Inter-Allied War Aims or of the Fourteen Points, only fails to do so because it is so completely contrary to their whole spirit that such military occupation, or even the need for pronouncing against it, was never contemplated in either. It is in fact wholly at variance with the declaration of the Inter-Allied Labour Conference (1918) that:—

"The League of Nations, in order to prepare for the concerted abolition of compulsory military service in all countries, must first take steps for the prohibition of fresh armaments on land and sea, and for the common limitation of the existing armaments by which all the peoples are already overburdened."

It is consistent with this declaration, because it logically and inevitably involves the maintenance of huge Allied Armies for the occupation of Germany, and in place of a policy of universal disarmament, a one-sided disarmament coupled with the maintenance of militarism among the Allies.

Occupation of the Rhineland.

The Permanent Commission of the Labour and Socialist International (April 26-29) voted the following resolution:—

The Conference energetically opposes all attempts, open or veiled, to separate portions of the German population from the main body of the German nation, as would be the case if the region of the Saar, the Palatinate and the left bank of the Rhine were detached from Germany. Such attempts would do violence to the principles of self-determination, and maintain a spirit of hatred and discord. They would, therefore, lay the foundation of new wars and violate the principles of the League of Nations.

The dangers involved in an occupation as prolonged as fifteen years have already begun to reveal themselves in most disturbing form.

A few months after the installation of the French military authorities in the Rhineland district, of which Mayence is the centre, and while the Berlin Government were grappling with all the difficulties of the nascent German Republic, a "separatist" movement, for the formation of an independent Rhineland Republic, began in Mayence and Weisbaden—also in French occupation. It was headed by quite obscure Germans and greeted, both in the Rhineland and in the rest of Germany, with a storm of protest. There was no attempt, even in the French Press, to disguise the fact that the movement had been fostered by the French military authorities on the Rhine.⁽¹⁾ An independent Rhineland making a buffer state as an alternate to the annexation of the country to France has been intermittently an openly avowed French policy since the days of Louis XIV.

But the action of the French authorities in the matter—and particularly one feature of it—is particularly suggestive in this connection, and has an especial interest for Labour. The "Proclamation" of the Separatist Government had been met by something resembling a general strike throughout the Rhineland. Reuter's special correspondent at Cologne (June 4) reported as follows:—

"Protests multiply daily against the action of the Separatists, which is generally condemned as not only unpatriotic, but foolish. There seems to be little support behind the mostly unknown men who framed the proclamation.

"In Mayence yesterday a three-days' strike of workmen and tradesmen was started as a protest against the new Republic, and all businesses and factories, as well as many shops, were closed early in the day, while the streets were filled with crowds.

"In Coblenz railway officials and workmen also stopped work for some hours in the morning by way of protest, but resumed work after mid-day. At a big meeting a resolution was passed against a Rhenish Republic, and it seems clear that the general opinion of the inhabitants of Coblenz of any weight is opposed to separation.

"For the rest the egregious Dr. Dorten has sent an explanatory statement of his position and actions to Berlin, but the Government has contented itself with a curt announcement enjoining the population to pay no attention to any orders they may receive from the so-called Executive of the Rhenish Republic."

We next learn, however, that this protest was met by wholesale arrests and imprisonments by the French authorities. The German authorities addressed to General Mangin the following appeal:—

"The French Military Court at Mayence has sentenced twenty-two railwaymen to terms of imprisonment aggregating thirty-three years and seven months in connection with a strike demonstration! These punishments include single sentences to imprisonment for five years. The severity of the sentences has created a feeling of

⁽¹⁾The following despatch appears in the English papers of June 7, dated Coblenz:—

"Despite reports to the contrary, the Rhine Republic movement is not making any progress in either the American or British areas, where, in the interest of public order, both military authorities are opposed to any change. The activities of Dr. Dorten are confined to Mayence and Wiesbaden and the rest of the French zone, where he enjoys the support of the French authorities.

"It is now admitted that the movement for a Rhine Republic was fostered by the French military authorities on the Rhine, under the leadership of General Mangin. An attempt was made to obtain the co-operation of the Americans over a week ago, but they refused.

dismay among all classes of the population, especially as the strike was not directed against the French occupational authorities, but against activities of a treasonable nature.

"I therefore appeal to you, Herr General, with the urgent request that, in view of the terrible severity of these punishments, you will mercifully make use of the right of pardon which is your prerogative."

It will be remembered how the German authorities in Belgium pursued a Separatist policy directed at the division of Flemings and Walloons in not dissimilar fashion.

The point is that if, when the period of military occupation draws to a close, we have the proclamation of a fictitious Rhineland Republic opposing re-union to Germany, the fact might well furnish to the Chauvinist and Imperialist parties in France an opportunity of reviving the old French military policy. The militarists would justify further military conflict with Germany "on behalf of the self-determination of the Rhinelanders." The situation would involve the perpetuation of the French military establishment. Intrigues of this kind by military cliques would be all the easier in view of the powers of censorship and police inherent in the state of siege which foreign military Government entails. As it is, German newspapers from unoccupied Germany are not allowed to enter the occupied areas, and all sorts of restrictions upon freedom of movement and communication are imposed. They may be necessary, but they constitute none the less an immense danger to the re-establishment of democracy in Germany itself and in Europe generally.

The matter raises the whole question as to what guarantee for the fulfilment of the Treaty is furnished by a prolonged occupation of German territory. Suppose the German Government does not fulfil the terms of the Treaty; or that poverty and bankruptcy prompt evasion of some of its terms at the end of ten or fifteen years. Will the Rhinelanders still be held under Alien military Government; will the annexation be made permanent? This is the use of human beings as "pawns," the denial of the right of self-determination, the punishment of one group for the offence of another all in one. Would the annexation of German populations, creating new Irelands for France, Belgium, and England, be any less demoralising to the democracies because certain bills had not been paid by the Berlin Government?

Allied Militarist Activity.

In any case the occupation involves the maintenance, during the best part of a generation, of large armies of occupation by the Allies while exacting the disarmament of Germany. This is in conflict with the declaration contained in the Fourteen Points (Point IV.) in favour of:—

"Adequate guarantees, *given and taken*, that national armaments will be reduced to the lowest possible point consistent with domestic safety."

Instead of "guarantees, *given and taken*," the draft Treaty exacts from Germany guarantees to be enforced by military occupation, involving the militarisation of the Allied peoples and entirely removing the possibility of a disarmament among the Allies corresponding to the disarmament imposed upon Germany.

The National Executive of the British Labour Party in their Manifesto of May 8 state :—

"We regret that the Treaty, which imposes a drastic measure of disarmament upon Germany, does not include provision for progressive limitation of the armaments of the other signatories to the Treaty, with the object of finally arriving at a general total disarmament."

The joint Manifesto of the National Executive of the Labour Party and the Parliamentary Labour Party (June 4) states :—

"In order to secure the concerted abolition of armaments and compulsory military service Labour believes that steps must be taken to prohibit the private manufacture of fresh armaments and to limit existing armaments."

"The Treaty, on the contrary, is likely to impose fresh burdens of this character upon the peoples as a consequence of the military occupation of the west bank of the Rhine for a period of fifteen years, and possibly longer. In such circumstances it will be impossible to take full advantage of the enforced disarmament of Germany in order to secure general disarmament and demilitarisation."

The Manifesto of the Committee of Action of the Berne International Labour and Socialist Conference (Paris, May 11) states :—

"The limitations imposed upon German armaments are a necessary condition to that general disarmament which the International has repeatedly declared to be the only hope of national security and peace, and which is made more imperative than ever by the creation of large numbers of new small States. The mere limitation of the German army, however, need not weaken European militarism, and therefore the International calls for a declaration that the Allies themselves proposed to abandon their present militarist policy and to reduce immediately their armaments on land and sea. Further, it must be noted that the settlement of frontiers for military reasons and the predominance of strategic considerations in certain of the provisions of the proposed Treaty tend to perpetuate armaments."

French Labour has protested against the one-sided character of the disarmament terms of the Treaty. The National Committee of the General Confederation of Labour (May 27) unanimously protested :—

"Against the impossibility of general disarmament, which can only take place if there is a new world-organisation, founded on other principles than those which have prevailed up to the present, and which the Peace treaty is resuming."

"Just as the National Committee loudly protested against the persistence of obligatory service at the time when every hand was needed for productive work, so it points out that unless there is general disarmament, the liquidation of war debts is a vain hope, for military budgets, and the charges resulting from armaments will continue to weigh on the people, and to hinder the task of reconstruction, without which there can be no restoration of the ruins which have been accumulating for more than four years."

The National Committee of the Belgian Labour Party (see *Le Peuple*, June 5) voted in this connection as follows :—

"The Party asserts the pressing necessity of giving Belgium and France bona fide moral and material guarantees against any repetition of aggression on the part of Germany. It considers that the two countries most directly exposed to a fresh blow should obtain securities, at least equal to those which England derives from the maintenance of her fleet, and America from the actual distance which separates her from the scene of conflict. It demands that these securities should be sought, not so much in the maintenance or increase of armaments on the part of the Allies, nor in the military occupation of portions of German territory, as in a disarmament which shall become more and more wide-spread, and strongly guaranteed by the very growth of the powers of the League of Nations."

How necessary is this reciprocity of disarmament is shown by the fact that already, the Jingo Press, alike in Britain, France, and America, is exploiting the popularity of military and naval leaders for

the purpose of *increasing* armaments (from beyond their pre-war standard) and rendering conscription permanent. The *Daily Mail* recently published a long interview with General Foch in the course of which the Generalissimo enlarged on the "inevitability" of war in the future and the need of being "prepared for it." This is followed by a booming of Sir Douglas Haig's call for "the training of every man for his country's defence."

The *Daily Mail's* appeal is typical:—

"We all desire peace, but we cannot, even in the hour of complete victory, disregard the injunction uttered by our first soldier, that 'only by adequate preparation for war can peace in every way be guaranteed.'

"A strong citizen army on strong territorial lines' is the advice Sir Douglas Haig urges on the country. A system providing twelve months' military training for every man in the country should be seriously thought of. We ought to be ready to fight in order that we may never have to fight. Morally and physically the war has shown to us that the effect of discipline and training upon the youth of the country is an asset beyond calculation."

In America popular military figures like General Leonard Wood—freely spoken of as republican candidate for President—echo Generals Foch and Haig. "This War has simply been a lesson that war will go on. . . . Pacifists tell lies when they say that war as an institution is dead." He consequently demands an immense American Army based on permanent conscription.

One meaning of all this is generally overlooked. It is an admission on the part of the very persons who demand "severe" and "punitive" treatment of Germany, that such treatment will altogether fail to preserve peace.

Sir Douglas Haig, in his Rectorial Address at St. Andrews, May 14, said:—

"The seeds of future conflict are to be found in every quarter, only awaiting the right condition, moral, economic, political, to burst once more into activity."

Moreover, men of the influence of Generals Foch and Wood are in the position of being able to make their prophecies of never-ending war come true. It is eminent Generals and Admirals of great personal influence in the Councils of Governments, whose decisions are taken without Parliamentary sanction, who are able, with the help of Chauvinistic newspapers, to rush the country into military adventures like the occupation of Petrograd, Moscow, Budapest, and Odessa, or the re-creation of a new military front reaching from Archangel to the Caspian Sea—all of which the *Times*, for instance, is now advocating. Thus, while we are planning the celebration of "Peace," new and vast wars are already being demanded—and begun. Nor is that all. These same forces, made up of an amalgam of private intrigue, newspaper propaganda, and Government irresponsibility, are moving towards the introduction of an Imperial protectionism which must bring the interests of the British Empire into opposition with those even of our Allies.

Mr. Bonar Law stated at the Guildhall that we are now waging twenty-three wars. One enumerates some of them as follows:—"There are ten distinct operations in Russia, one in Siberia, one in Transcaspia, one in the Balkan States, two in Hungary, one in Austria, one in India, one in Kurdistan, one in Arabia. That makes nineteen. Then the Poles are in action against a group of Germans."

Another authority is more precise with this list:—1. We are, in Georgia, defending the Georgians from Denikin and Denikin from the

Georgians. 2. We are fighting in Turkestan and have recently evacuated Merv. 3. We are fighting in Afghanistan. 4. Colonel John Ward and the Middlesex Regiment are (or recently were) in Siberia assisting Kolchak. 5. Our expeditions based on Archangel and Murmansk are fighting in various parts of Northern Russia. 6. Rumanians are fighting against Bela Kun under Allied inspiration. 7. Czechoslovaks are fighting Hungarians. 8. Poles are fighting Ukrainians. 9. Ukrainians are fighting Hungarians. 10. German troops are fighting Letts and have re-occupied the country. 11. Estonians are fighting Germans. 12. Germans are fighting Bolsheviks. 13. Estonians, urged by Allies, are fighting Bolsheviks (much against their will). 14. Finns are fighting Russians. 15. Kolchak, with Allied assistance, is fighting against the Bolsheviks in the east. 16. General Denikin, with Allied assistance, is fighting against Bolsheviks in the south-east. 17. The British Navy is in the Baltic assisting in shelling Cronstadt. 18. The British Navy is in the Black Sea assisting Denikin.

PART III.

RUSSIA, THE TREATY, AND INDUSTRIAL DEMOCRACY IN EUROPE.

Why the Russian situation cannot be dissociated from the Treaty. Reasons for Labour's emphatic stand on Russian policy: the key to the future of industrial democracy throughout the world. Labour standing not for Bolshevism, but against reaction.

The signature of one of the belligerents, Russia, does not appear on the Peace Treaty at all. Yet the Treaty, and the situation it creates, cannot be adequately dealt with in the absence of that belligerent. Mr. J. L. Garvin wrote recently:—

"The real key to the future does not lie in Germany. It lies in Russia. That is the 'acid test' of the Allies' capacity. There can be no basis of natural stability in the world until a strong and a free ~~Prussia~~ ^{Russia} is restored and brought fully into the League of Nations."

To this extent he is in agreement with Labour. The 1919 Conference of the Labour Party at Southport passed this resolution:—

"This Conference protests against the continued intervention by the Allies in Russia, whether by force of arms, by supply of munitions, by financing subsidies, or by commercial blockade. It calls for the immediate cessation of such intervention; it demands the removal of the censorship so that an unbiassed public opinion may be formed upon the issues involved; it denounces the assistance given by the Allies to reactionary bodies in Russia as being a continuation of the war in the interests of financial capitalism, which aims at the destruction of the Russian Socialist Republic and as being a denial of the rights of peoples to self-determination and it instructs the National Executive to consult the Parliamentary Committee of the Trades Union Congress with the view to effective action being taken to enforce these demands by the unreserved use of their political and industrial power."

This is in keeping with the declarations of French and Italian Labour. The French General Confederation of Labour protests (May 11) as follows:—

"The C.G.T. protests vigorously against the expedition in Russia, an Allied country, against which no official declaration of war has been made."

"The continuation of this policy of intervention makes France the guardian of the reactionary privileges and institutions of all countries."

"The working-classes, the people of France, cannot subscribe to this humiliating and dishonourable attitude."

Nor has French action been confined to mere verbal resolutions or to Labour circles.

The *Times* of July 7 has a communication from Paris "lifting the veil" which the censor had thrown over certain "regrettable incidents" at Odessa in the operations against the Bolsheviks. The correspondent says:—

"In Odessa, as at Sebastopol, there were but few French troops, and they had to evacuate both places in circumstances which were, to say the least of it, unfortunate. It was, in fact, very largely due to the forbearing assistance of the Bolsheviks themselves that the evacuation was rendered possible at all. The French Black Sea Fleet mutinied. The Red Flag of the Social Revolution was hoisted, together with the Tricolor, and for a time the control of the Fleet passed from the hands of the officers into that of the men."

It was a revolt of French troops against the Russian anti-Soviet expedition.

We know, also, now (see, among others, New York despatches, *Daily News*, July 7, 1919) that the American troops in Northern Russia, as well as in Siberia, mutinied when ordered to fight the Soviet forces.

The Socialist Party of the Italian Parliament (the Resolution passed unanimously by forty-one Deputies), May 17, voted as follows:—

"That the imperialistic nature of the war works most strongly against the working-class forces, whether these are already organised on a communist basis or are progressing rapidly towards a collectivist regime, is proven flagrantly by the Entente recognition of the adventurer Koltchak, the sinister representative of Tsarist reaction, against the will of the Russian revolutionary working-classes. The result of all this is that, side by side with the intensified class struggle within each State, an international class struggle is appearing, which aims at destroying the hope of emancipation of the working-classes of the whole world."

What underlies these protests? Why, for instance, did the British Labour Party attach so much importance to the Russian policy as to make it the occasion of the first step towards what would be the most momentous development in the history of British Democracy?

The gravity of the step is justified by the fact that in the Russian policy is involved the whole future of industrial democracy throughout the world. Let us get the situation clearly. British Labour does not approve the methods employed by the Soviets—if reports, which are unlikely, however, to be the whole truth, are indeed reliable. But the present policy of the Government in supporting counter-revolutionary military dictators must ally this country, whether that be the intention of the Government or not, with reactionary forces in Russia. For only by the aid of those forces can the parties represented by leaders like Denikin and Koltchak impose their power. We are fighting, in other words, for Russian parties working to destroy not only the present Bolshevik régime, but any Socialist or Communist régime whatsoever.

Indeed, in the obscurity and secrecy of the Conference there seems to have been evolved very clearly a determination to forbid any people to try the experiment of communistically socialist government and to use our military and naval power—particularly the latter, in its capacity to create or intensify famine through blockade "the instrument of starvation," as Mr. Churchill calls it—to suppress such socialistic experiments. We were committed to this policy by secret decisions, so

secret indeed that while these new expeditions were being prepared certain Governments were giving solemn assurances that under no circumstances would such a policy be pursued. President Wilson declared that such would be the repudiation of the principles he had enunciated, principles which should find their "acid test" in our treatment of the Russian Republic.

Then suddenly the democracies discovered that their soldiers were in Russia fighting the Soviet Republic, that agreements had been made to support its monarchist counter-revolutionary enemies with money and supplies. The Governments, after having by turns denied and defended this course, have now allowed it to be known that our definite policy is to suppress all Governments founded on Soviet or Communist principles.⁽¹⁾

Yet the British Government itself seems to feel the moral difficulty of its policy in Russia by the line of its defence of its Russian policy. This has always been to minimise the extent of our aid to the counter-revolutionary parties. In defending the sending of men to Archangel and Murmansk Mr. Churchill rested his whole case on the fact that it was designed simply for the purpose of assisting the withdrawal of existing forces. Again and again Mr. Churchill has taken the line that our expeditions to Russia are "trifling," or on the point of being withdrawn. Then why are we mixing in the matter at all? Why repudiate our intervention, if, as is claimed, it is in the interest of the highest humanity? If our aid to the counter-revolutionaries is morally defensible, there is no need to minimise its extent: we should be proud of its effectiveness. If, indeed, as is claimed, it is our duty to rescue Russia from a tyranny, then Mr. Churchill ought to be ashamed to declare that the expeditions are so small. As a matter of fact, it is not the number of men sent out by which the extent of our intervention

(1) On 12th April the Vienna Government were officially and expressly informed by the British Military Plenipotentiary that "if riots should occur in German-Austria, the import of food and raw materials would be entirely stopped at once." On April 17th the Italian Mission at Salzburg gave the same warning in the event of a "Communist or Bolshevist rising." The chief Vienna paper hastened to remind the Viennese that "famine of a kind to make one shudder" would ensue. Vienna would have "literally nothing," and "the two million people who inhabit this town have only one common duty . . . salvation from bestial, merciless hunger." The Supreme Economic Council has placed Hungary and Russia outside the scope of its Relief Fund, simply on the ground of the character of its Government.

The London papers of July 14 contain the following despatches:—

"Bela Kun has addressed a long telegram to M. Clemenceau, pointing out that while the Hungarian troops have ceased hostilities against the Czecho-Slovaks and withdrawn to the frontiers fixed, the Rumanian troops have not only not yet begun withdrawal from the Theiss line, on to the specified boundaries, but have undertaken attacks on several places. Bela Kun finally urges the Allied and Associated Governments again to order the Rumanian troops to withdraw, and to get their orders respected."—Reuter.

"The Allies have sent a wireless message to Bela Kun informing him that as he will not carry out the conditions of the armistice they cannot enter into any discussions with him."—Central News.

"According to a Press report from Bucharest, General Franchet d'Esperey has requested the Budapest Government to make place for a Government freely elected by the people, otherwise military action will be immediately taken against Hungary."—Reuter.

"According to the Rumanian Press Bureau here an offensive against the Hungarian Soviet Government is imminent and will be directed by Gen. Franchet d'Esperey."—Exchange.

must be measured, but the amount of ammunition and material and general economic aid furnished to the monarchist counter-revolutionaries. This will be the decisive factor. As the *Manchester Guardian* (June 12) says :—

“ Either we are at war with Russia or we are not. If we are, then the war should be formally declared, and the grounds for it clearly stated. But to make war without doing either of these things is to indulge in something which a rude person might plausibly describe as piracy, and which in any case is something not quite worthy of a nation sedulous for the maintenance of international law.

“ What we are doing is to go about killing men to whom we have never given any reason why we should kill them. Conversely, we are sacrificing the lives of gallant men in our own Army and Navy without taking the trouble to explain to them or to those who are called upon to mourn their loss for what good reason or in what good cause their blood is shed. It is a bad and dishonouring business, of which those who are responsible for it ought to be deeply ashamed, and which the people at large should take every opportunity of disowning and punishing.”

It is ridiculous to pretend, as the Government does, that uneasiness as to the moral justification of our course in Russia is confined to “ Bolsheviks.” It has excited the indignation of a round score of Englishmen, Frenchmen, and Americans—Red Cross men, journalists, Government officials—who happen to be familiar with the facts at first hand. The list includes men like Colonel Raymond Robbins, who was the head of the American Red Cross in Russia, and was for months in close, almost daily, contact with Lenin and the Soviet Government; Colonel Thompson, also of the American Red Cross; Mr. William Bullitt, of the American Peace Delegation in Paris (who visited Lenin on behalf of Mr. Wilson as lately as March last, and who subsequently sent in his resignation); John Reed and Lincoln Steffens, the American journalists; Mr. Arthur Ransome, the *Daily News* correspondent, and many more. They include, also, Mr. Douglas Young, ex-British Consul at Archangel, who, replying in the *Times* (Dec. 19, 1918) to some statements by Rear-Admiral Kemp, writes :—

“ Admiral Kemp divides British opinion on the Russian situation into two classes only, interventionists and pro-Bolsheviks. Does he not realise that there is a considerable body of thoughtful men, Unionists and Liberals, as well as Labour men, of no less patriotism than himself, who are anti-interventionist by conviction and who feel that our dealings with the Soviet Government do not accord with the British tradition of fair play and honest dealing even with an ignoble foe? Can he not admit that the actions of certain British representatives in Russia, with or without the knowledge and sanction of the British Government, gave the Soviet Government good grounds for suspecting us of deceiving them and of playing a deliberate double game? Does he not remember the, to me, memorable afternoon of July 6, when some time between 4 and 6 p.m., in the Presidium Chamber of the Archangel Soviet, he informed them in my presence that, ‘ speaking for himself, and he was sure he could say the same for General Poole, he could assure them that Allied action in the White Sea was not aimed against the Soviet Government ’? And has he forgotten another similar meeting a few days later, when with scowling faces the Soviet representatives communicated reports of high-handed action by the Allied military and naval forces on the western shores of the White Sea, including the shooting of three members of the Kem Soviet? Does he deny that these reports, which were subsequently confirmed, swept away like a house of cards my attempts to reach a *modus vivendi* with the local Soviet authorities? They at any rate were ready until the last to come to an arrangement with us on the basis of the exchange of goods, but they would not sell their birthright—their right to resist our landing except it were done ‘ upon their invitation ’—for an Allied mess of pottage, the food of which they were in sore need.

“ Can we not negotiate and endeavour to remove suspicion and misunderstandings which have arisen, in part at any rate, through our failure to fit our actions

towards Russia to the 'acid test' enunciated by President Wilson? If and when negotiation fails, and the Soviet Government formally proclaims itself to the world as the champion of anarchy and of the extermination of the upper classes, then will it be time enough to consider whether the civilised Powers, Allied and neutral alike, shall proclaim a holy war against this evil thing and call for volunteers to stamp it out, even if it takes 10 years."

That the British Government at this time, itself felt that the situation called for some attempt at negotiation is proven by the suggestion of Mr. Lloyd George (revealed by the publication in the *Humanité* of a secret despatch to the French Government) to the Allies that representatives of the Soviet Government be invited to Paris. The suggestion was furiously resisted by M. Pichon. Another attempt towards negotiations was made. It was suggested this time that the representatives of all political parties in Russia be invited, not to Paris, but to the Island of Prinkipo. Officially and publicly, the French Government acquiesced, although the Russian emigres in Paris used all their influence to defeat the proposal. They were successful.

We know now (see documents published by *Manchester Guardian* of June 16, 1919) that the Prinkipo proposal was never officially transmitted to Moscow. We know further that whereas all the counter-revolutionary Governments refused, the Soviet Government accepted the invitation on terms most favourable to us (see *Common Sense*, May 10, and Mr. Ransome's "Six Weeks in Russia," pp. 30-42), and that their acceptance killed the scheme. We know further (*Manchester Guardian's* correspondent at Helsingfors, May 27) that Lenin accepted the Nansen proposal and asked for the nomination of Entente delegates. the Allied Governments invited all the *de facto* Governments existing in Russia to a new Peace Conference upon a basis agreed to by all the Allied Powers, leaving only details to be further arranged. The Soviet Government made some modifications, and these were accepted by Bullitt. The open invitations should have been sent out on April 10.

They were never sent out, and the whole transaction was shrouded in secrecy, at the insistence of the Allies. But now (July, 1919) the Soviet Government issues the terms of the proposal, which ran as follows:—

The principal points in the Allied terms were:

An armistice to be declared on all Russian fronts whilst the Peace delegates were discussing the following:—

1. All the Governments formed within the territory of the old Russian Empire to keep their full power over the territories occupied by them, until the inhabitants should declare the form of Government preferred by them.

2. None of such Governments to attempt to overthrow another by force.

3. The blockade of Russia to be raised.

4. Re-establishment of commercial relations.

5. All produce existing or received in Russia to be accessible to all classes of the population without any distinction.

6. All the above Russian Governments to grant full and complete amnesty to political opponents, soldiers included.

7. The Allied troops to evacuate Russia.

8. Simultaneous reduction of the Soviet and of the Anti-Soviet armies to peace footing.

9. All the above Russian Governments to recognise, jointly, the financial obligations of the former Russian Empire.

10. Freedom of residence and movement of all Russian subjects over all parts of Russia.

11. Repatriation of all prisoners of war.

England and America were to guarantee the observance of these terms on the part of France.

The message, of which above is part, goes on :—

Although the Red Army was then on the eve of taking possession of Odessa, the Crimea, and the Don region, the Soviet Government was ready to accept these terms; to accept the *status quo*; in the certain hope that the inhabitants of those parts would, sooner or later, withdraw their support from their reactionary and monarchic Governments.

The Soviet Government was ready to accept, but the Allies withdrew.

The attitude of the Allies towards the Soviet Government is generally defended on the ground that Bolshevik atrocities have been such as to make recognition of their Government impossible.

Several points stand out with reference to that. First, though atrocities and bloodthirsty cruelty were a known feature of the Tsarist Government, that not only did not prevent recognition; it did not prevent alliance. Secondly, the evidence of atrocities by the "White" parties that we are supporting in Russia and in Finland is even clearer, both as to extent and character, than that which we urge as reason for our refusal to recognise the Bolsheviks. Thirdly, we have condemned the Hungarian Soviet Government without even alleging "atrocities." Fourthly, in so far as Governments have managed to secure acquiescence in their policy from inert and tired public opinion, it has been a system of deliberately "cooking" and faking the evidence by refusing to allow publication of the Soviet side of the case and giving extensive and artificial publicity to the evidence of the monarchist parties. The Soviet Government of Russia has never had a fair trial in the court of Western public opinion, which has been distorted by a one-sided and falsified presentation of the case to a degree of which the public as a whole are absolutely unaware.⁽¹⁾ While hearing has been refused to the representatives of the Soviet Government, the representatives of the counter-revolutionary groups, mainly monarchist, have had free and ample access to the representatives of the Allied Powers now in Paris; Sazonoff, the Tsar's ex-Minister, is known to be in close and constant touch with the French and British foreign offices.

The British Labour Party has, from first to last, unequivocally condemned the violence which has marked some phases of the Russian Revolution and of its Bolshevik development. But it declines to lend itself to the injustice which would make violence and tyranny offences only to be invoked internationally when they are committed by a revolution fighting for its life, and to be disregarded when committed by dynastic and tyrannical autocracies.

One cannot, unhappily, overlook the fact that the evidence of the "White" Terror in Russia and Finland—the Terror imposed by the military dictators whom we are supporting—is as damning as that brought against the Bolsheviks.

Very carefully analysed evidence has appeared in organs like the *New Republic* (notably July 2, 1919) and the *New Statesman*, showing that the violence of repression and the numbers of executions by the Finnish Government which we have now recognised are proportionately

(1) Take the stories concerning the "nationalisation of women." The publication of the Soviet Marriage Law proves the alleged "proclamation" on which these stories were at first based to be a forgery. Yet as late as June 12 the *Times* in a leading article refers to "nationalisation" as though the story had never been exposed.

very much greater than those even alleged against the Bolsheviks. Mr. William Hard writes (*New Republic*, July 2, 1919):—

"In Finland, in the spring of 1918, when the Finnish Civil War was over, the White-Guard Finnish Government (of property-owners) was possessed of the persons of some 120,000 Red citizens as prisoners. The figure 120,000 is given out by the official White-Guard Finnish Government Information Service in the United States. . . . In December, 1918, the White-Guard Finnish Government issued a certain amnesty. It was to White Guards. It was to those numerous White Guards who had shot Red prisoners without any trial, civil or military. All such White Guards were granted a permanent immunity from prosecution or punishment for any such acts."

Judge Tanner, in a Finnish court, on March 18, 1919, testified that:—

"Altogether the number of the executed and of the murdered among the prisoners, on the basis of reports still very incomplete, is 15,817."

An English correspondent of the *New Statesman*, of London, after a detailed study of the evidence, supported Judge Tanner. He said that "at Lahti 200 women were taken out early one morning in the second week of May and mowed down in a batch by machine-guns." The total number of Reds executed or murdered was from 15,000 to 20,000.

Mr. Hard comments:—

"The Red Guard Government of Russia, in order to equal the White Guard Government of Finland as an executioner and starver of political opponents in prison, would have to execute and starve 750,000 captured and incarcerated anti-Bolsheviks."

Yet we have recognised the Finnish Government and fight the Bolsheviks, notwithstanding that its dictator, Mannerheim, is monarchist and undisguisedly pro-German. When the Finns who had formed part of the German army returned from Germany, Mannerheim addressed them as follows:—

"At the request of the Finnish Government, detachments of Germany's victorious army have landed on Finnish soil to help us drive out the Bolsheviks. I am convinced that this brotherhood in arms will only serve to strengthen the friendship and confidence which Finland has always felt for Germany's great Kaiser and his mighty people. I hope that Finland's young army may become permeated with that lofty sense of duty which has served to create the greatness of the army of Germany. I bid Germany's brave warriors welcome to Finland."

The simple truth is this: even assuming that some of the worst stories of Lenin and Trotsky are true, our policy of intervention will merely compel us to support military and monarchist dictators whose methods are every bit as ruthless, anti-democratic, and cruel. This fact has been hidden from the public heretofore. Only now is the real character of the "Allies" whom we propose to install in Russia leaking out. Even the more conservative French press, heretofore most hostile to admissions of this kind, is beginning to admit the truth. Thus the Special Correspondent of the *Petit Parisien* with Koltchak's armies reveals the secret frankly. "Among the administrative, and especially among the military personnel," he writes, "are people who understand a revival of power only as a return, pure and simple, to the system of oppression of Tsarism." They "flog or shoot without trial," he continues, "persons rightly or wrongly held by them to be suspect," and the result is that the peasants and the soldiers who witness or suffer these abuses, begin to suffer from "a tiresome uncertainty as to the utility

of replacing the men of the Soviets by masters who are worth no more." The unhappy correspondent is trying timidly to convey his meaning. In plain words Koltchak's soldiers desert from him, and the peasants rise against him at the first approach of a Soviet army. And this they do, because they have learned by experience that the triumph of Koltchak would mean the restoration of Tsardom.

These things we have long known in a general way. The evidence was ample, but across the great distance and the censor's curtain it usually reached us in an unimpressive form. We have now, however, in adequate length and detail, from a competent witness, a full narrative of what the Koltchak system is. The *New Republic* (July 9) has published under the title of "The Rise of a New Russian Autocracy," a final and decisive revelation from the pen of Dr. Joshua Rosett. His qualifications are undoubted: he was sent out to Siberia by the official American "Committee on Public Information"; he speaks Russian well; he is evidently a good observer, and partly in work for the War Trade Board, partly under the Red Cross, he had, during a nine-months' stay in Siberia, every opportunity for observing events and opinions before and after Koltchak's *coup d'état*. He is, moreover, no admirer of Bolshevism, which he regards as "an historical soap-bubble." His summary of that ruler's performances may be quoted:—

"Koltchak . . . whom I have seen break up a democratic government in Siberia with a ruthlessness of a Tartar conqueror; who has suppressed free speech and free press; who has either jailed or exiled or murdered every member of the Russian Constituent Assembly upon whom he could lay his hands; and who caused the opponents of his rule of the fist to be tortured and killed."

Dr. Rosett describes how the news of Koltchak's *coup d'état* of November, the dissolution of the Convention, and the arrest of the elected Directorate, all through the action of the army, gradually reached Vladivostok. He had heard of Koltchak already, from an ex-priest turned officer. This man had been sent from France to start a propaganda for the restoration of the autocracy—not, however, in the person of a Romanoff.

"There is but one man in Russia who is strong enough to meet the situation. He is known to be faithful to the Holy Greek Catholic religion, and he alone can be depended upon to purge the sacred ground of Russia of Jews, Poles, Bolsheviks, infidels, and foreigners."

The Strong Man, of course, was Koltchak. His emissary presently appeared at Vladivostok, and placards all over the town announced that a certain self-appointed Council of Ministers had decided "to hand over temporarily the highest governmental power to Admiral Alexander Koltchak, attaching to him the title of *Supreme Ruler*." There followed a statement from his Supremacy over his own signature: "*This day I have taken Chief Command of All the Power of the Land and Sea of Russia*." The people of the town were aghast, and Dr. Rosett records their naïve expressions of horror and their forebodings of bloodshed. Next, there followed the solemn publication of articles of the Criminal Code which conveyed to Koltchak all the attributes of the old Autocrat. Anyone guilty of an attempt against the Supreme Ruler, or "of a violent attempt at the overthrow or change of the existing order of government, or at the separation or secession of any part of the Russian territory shall suffer the punishment of death." The punishment for any insult by word of mouth, in handwriting, or in print, against the Supreme

Ruler was imprisonment. Finally, came a truly Oriental Holy-Russian touch :—

“ Paragraph 329 of the Code of Criminal Corrective Punishments.—Any person guilty of the conscious nonfulfilment of an order by the Supreme Ruler is subject to the punishment of being deprived of all rights and confinement to hard labour for a term of from fifteen-twenty years.”

Admiral Koltchak, one perceives, was busily “ making democracy safe.”

At Omsk, every known or suspected malcontent was branded as a Bolshevik and arrested accordingly, including the members of the Constituent Assembly. An attempt at a rising against Koltchak was made near Omsk, and as the official proclamation put it, “ the Supreme Ruler ordered the merciless execution of all persons who attempted to create disturbances.”

“ The simple words of the telegram do not begin to tell the story. The reader may know that the Omsk district is one of the coldest inhabited spots of the world. The December of 1918 was one of the coldest on record. Koltchak's men made use of this fact; they stripped the rebels and drove them naked through the streets, and in agony they confessed the names and hiding-places of their leaders. They were then placed in rows and shot, and their frozen bodies piled into freight cars. Protuding arms and legs were severed with a blow of the axe. The cars were pulled out of town and the bodies dumped in heaps to wait for the spring.”

One of the alleged “ Bolsheviks ” who were thus done to death was a leader of the Russian Co-operative movement, Mr. Meiske, well known during his long stay in London, who was as we imagine most, if not all, of Koltchak's victims were, a member of the most moderate Social-Democrat “ Menshevik ” group.

An anti-Bolshevik witness, friendly to Koltchak, thus describes him :—

“ Koltchak scouted the notion of man's equality, quoting the Papal dictum (Pius X.) ‘ that God has ordained a human society composed of princes and subjects, employers and workers, rich and poor, learned and ignorant, nobles and plebeians.’ Therefore, the rank and file must obey without questioning, or take the consequences. If he had more polish and self-control, Admiral Marakoff told Koltchak, he might one day hope to rival the fame of Nelson himself. But as years went by, Koltchak's temperament became still more pronounced.

“ Even as a middy in the old cruiser Rurik, Alexander Koltchak was dreaded by his men; for he was an officer who swore by the knout and the knock-down blow.

“ His genius for dealing with demoralised crews became a legend in the Imperial Navy, in its troublous and stormy days. His flag was no sooner flown in a new ship, than he called the crew to hear his ‘ Tartar ’ admonitions. ‘ If I catch one of you tripping,’ he told them bluntly, ‘ I shall punish you then and there. I *must*. For if I waited a day I should be angry. If I waited two days, I'd be furious. And if I nursed my wrath for *three* days I'd shoot you at sight!’ These words were snapped with clicking teeth and blazing eyes, and a peculiar motion of the pistol-hand.

“ ‘ Make them all drunk,’ he told a sub-Admiral who brought news of yet another desperate rising. ‘ Vodka can be a great friend to authority.’ ”

There is a painfully close resemblance between the present relations of the Allies to Russia and the relation of dynastic Europe to the French Revolution. That Revolution was marked also by terror. The fact of such terror was utilised by Toryism in Europe as justifying the suppression of the French Revolution as the enemy of order and civilisation. The French Revolution was suppressed. But the attempt to suppress it brought into being the military dictatorship which it took Europe 20 years to destroy, and having destroyed it, it was not the Republic which

was restored to France but the monarchy, and the war against French militarism ended in a League of Nations which in effect declared that such experiments in political democracy as the French Revolution would not be permitted. For British opinion at that time the French Revolution was merely the Terror and the September Massacres, but we know now that that great event was much more than those incidental violences, that it marked something vital and necessary to the developments of human freedom. So now, although we do not approve the methods of the Russian Socialistic Republic, the attempt to give to democracy a new meaning by grafting on to its political forms some method of industrial self-government, however blunderingly that attempt may be made, is an experiment which mankind direly needs. And yet as the war against French militarism ended, in the attempt of the Governments to suppress political democracy, so now the war against German militarism seems to be ending in an Alliance of Governments to repress industrial democracy and just the same cause nearly a century ago when the French Revolution was involved.

The matter is of the deepest concern to the Labour movement. If it acquiesces in the attempt to destroy Hungary's or Russia's experiment in industrial democracy, if it acquiesces in alliance with the Russian Reactionaries to re-establish the monarchist system in Russia—a thing which is now actually taking place before our eyes—it will be open to the charge of having betrayed democracy and that industrial development of political republicanism which the Russian and Hungarian experiments, purged of their errors and excesses, might with sympathy grow into.

PART IV.

SUMMARISATION.

POINTS ON WHICH REVISIONIST EFFORTS MUST CONCENTRATE.

A study of the declarations here reproduced reveals clearly the fact that apart from the American, all the great Labour bodies of the world are pledged to the Revision of the Peace Treaty as it now stands. What method of revision presents itself? How can international Labour carry its declarations into effect?

One or two facts stand out.

One is that full effect cannot be given to Labour declarations until the existing governments of the belligerents have been replaced by others of a more truly democratic character; that indeed a real international peace cannot be established while the national policies of the principal belligerents are in the control of reactionary elements.

While it is evident, therefore, that active efforts towards the capture of political power in every state is part of the process of full revision, those efforts do not exclude resort to the machinery provided in the League of Nations for the purpose of attempting to secure a revision of the worst injustices of the Treaty.

Under the provisions of the Covenant the Assembly may advise the reconsideration of Treaties, deal with matters affecting the peace of the world, and (by two-thirds majority) admit any state to membership of the League.

Labour and Socialist Parties can, therefore, bring pressure to bear upon their Governments by interpellation or by demanding that the Assembly of the League be convened at the time announced for the meeting of the Labour Commission of the League in October.

The points of revision indicated by the declarations of Labour so far made are the following :—

1. Immediate admission of Germany and Austria to the League, and
2. Revision of the Treaties with Germany and Austria on the following points :—

ECONOMIC.

1. Sums in reparation demanded of Germany should be fixed, not indeterminate.
2. Arrangements for reparation should not be made a means of annexation in disguise or a means of placing workers under a Government in which they have no share. Saar Valley arrangements should be amended to assure France the necessary coal without placing the population under French rule.
3. The arrangements for securing payment (the Reparation Commission arrangements) should be made by the League of Nations, not merely by the Allies.
4. Germany's and Austria's access to raw materials and economic opportunities should be assured by definite provisions guaranteed by the League of Nations, and not left to the discretionary power of Germany's late enemies and present economic rivals.
5. Arrangements for the control of credit, shipping, food, raw materials should be definitely entrusted to bodies in which the late enemy States should have representation under the League of Nations, instead of being (in fact) in the hands of bodies dominated by two or three of the chief Allies. The consideration governing the apportioning of necessities of life should be the degree of vital need, not the degree of the capacity to pay. (Such international controls are essential to the successful working of any international Labour Charter, and to prevent exploitation by private international capitalist rings.)
6. All economic provisions with reference to favoured nation treatment, railroad transit, internationalisation of rivers, canals, in the Treaty should be made reciprocal, *i.e.*, Germany should be included in their benefits as well as in their obligations.

TERRITORIAL.

1. The annexation—even temporary—of the Saar Valley should be rescinded, and French rights limited to the receipt of the coal.
2. All limitations upon German Austria's right to determine her future relations to Germany should be removed.
3. Permission to the predominantly German areas of Czecho-Slovakia to determine their political future should be granted.
4. The same right should be accorded to the German districts of the Tyrol included within the new Italian frontiers.

5. The districts of Western Prussia, predominantly German, should be permitted to remain German, access to the Baltic being assured to Poland by the internationalisation of the Vistula and the making of a free port of Dantzic, whose foreign relations should be under the control, not of Poland, but of the League of Nations, and whose internal affairs should be under her own control, not Poland's.

6. The plebiscites in Silesia and East Prussia should be under the League of Nations, and not an inter-Allied Commission. All provisions, as in the Annex to Article 88 of the Treaty, demanding the dissolution of workmen's organisations before the plebiscites be begun, shall be annulled.

7. In the Province of Shantung, the sovereign rights of China should be fully recognised and protected, and the arrangements which make the Allies the accomplices of the worst form of Imperialism, and which the League of Nations is asked to approve, should be cancelled.

COLONIES.

1. Equality of economic opportunity in all non-self-governing colonies should be assured under the League of Nations.

2. All such colonies and not merely the conquered German colonies should be subject to the mandate principle.

3. The conquered Colonies should be ceded to the League of Nations, not to the Allies. The mandates should be granted by the League of Nations, not the Allies.

4. Germany should be afforded an opportunity to become a mandatory under the League.⁽¹⁾

DISARMAMENT.

The disarmament should be made general, not one-sided. This involves a drastic reduction of the period of occupation on the Left Bank of the Rhine. The schemes of disarmament should apply to Navies as well as to Armies.

LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

1. There should be a constitutional revision involving the creation of a body, distinct from the existing Assembly (which is representative of States as equal units, each being obliged to vote as one irrespective of divisions, as say, between Socialists and non-Socialists within each State), representing the people, as distinct from the States, in the same sense in which the American House of Representatives, composed of Delegates from the people, is distinct from the Senate, which is composed of Delegates from the States. This revision would fulfil the demand of the Berne International for "a central representative organ made up not by delegates of the executive branches of the governments of the constituent States, but by delegates from the Parliaments repre-

(1) From the Manifesto of the National Executive of the Labour Party, May 8, 1918. Also embodied in the resolution of the Permanent Commission, Amsterdam, April, 1919. The latter resolution protests against depriving Germany of her colonies.

senting all parties therein, thus ensuring not an alliance of cabinets or governments, but a union of peoples."

2. A permanent World Economic Council, for investigating and supervising the production and distribution of foodstuffs and raw materials, with the object of preventing monopoly, unfair pressure upon the weak, and international profiteering, should be created and placed under the control of the League in accordance with the recommendations already made by the International.

3. The Assembly should discuss the solution of the more pressing of those questions which, apart from the changes made by the war, affect the peace of the world, such as the position of subject nations like Egypt, India, and Ireland, and of old possessions whose affairs call for revision, a special case being that of Cyprus, whose cession to Greece should be considered.

RUSSIA.

The situation with respect to Russia above sketched is this :—

The Entente Governments are giving material aid to groups and parties in Russia and elsewhere, which if triumphant will establish, not a democracy—not even a Bourgeois-Liberal political democracy—but a military dictatorship of autocratic Tsarist reaction. The choice which is presented is not as between two kinds of Socialism, not even as between two forms of democracy. The Workers are now asked to support an anti-Parliamentary Black Hundred Dictatorship; a Koltchak Napoleonism based on White Terrorism, a monarchical, ecclesiastical, land-owning, military conscript imperialism. The facts now brought to light concerning the circumstances in which the Koltchak régime came to power in Siberia show that the support accorded to it is on behalf of Parliamentary Democracy as against Socialist Dictatorship, it is on behalf of monarchist reaction as against any form of real democracy.

Various Labour declarations, therefore, oppose the present intervention of the Allied governments in Russia for the following reasons :—

1. It is an obvious interference by outside dictatorship with the right of the people to choose its own form of government.

2. It is not in the interests of democracy or Socialism.

3. It is not the result of a declaration of war or of Parliamentary sanction, but is action resulting from secret diplomatic commitments.

4. It is prompted by militarists and capitalists interested in the restoration of Tsardom.

5. It is carried on in defiance of the fact that offers of peace have been made by the Russian and Hungarian Governments.

PART V.

DOCUMENTS.

- I.—GERMAN COUNTER PROPOSALS AND OBJECTIONS
(COUNT RANTZAU'S STATEMENT).
- II.—MANIFESTOS BY GENERAL SMUTS.
- III.—PROTEST OF MR. BULLITT, AMERICAN COMMISSIONER.
- IV.—A BELGIAN PROTEST.
- V.—PROTEST OF BRITISH UNIVERSITY MEN.
- VI.—PRESIDENT WILSON'S FOURTEEN POINTS AND FIVE
POINTS.
- VII.—ALLIED MEMORANDUM TO GERMAN GOVERNMENT
OF NOV. 5, 1918.

I.—GERMAN OBJECTIONS: COUNTER PROPOSALS.

The German objections and counter-proposals have not so far been published in England. A brief summary of them appears below.

On receiving the text of the Draft Treaty at Versailles, Count Brockdorff-Rantzau delivered the following address:—

GENTLEMEN,—We are deeply impressed with the sublime task which has brought us hither to give a durable peace to the world. We are under no illusion as to the extent of our defeat and the degree of our want of power. We know that the power of the German arms is broken. We know the power of the hatred which we encounter here, and we have heard the passionate demand that the victors shall make us pay as the vanquished, and shall punish those who are worthy of being punished.

It is demanded of us that we shall confess ourselves to be the only ones guilty of the war. Such a confession in my mouth would be a lie. We are far from declining any responsibility for this great world-war having come to pass and for its having been made in the way in which it was made. The attitude of the former German Government at the Hague Peace Conference, its actions and omissions in the tragic twelve days of July, certainly contributed to the disaster, but we energetically deny that Germany and its people, who were convinced that they were making a war of defence, were alone guilty.

THE OUTBREAK OF WAR.

Nobody will want to contend that the disaster took its course only in the disastrous moment when the heir to the throne of Austria-Hungary fell the victim of murderous hands. In the last fifty years the Imperialism of all European States has chronically poisoned the international situation. The policy of retaliation and the policy of expansion and the disregard of the rights of people to determine their own destiny have contributed to the illness of Europe, which reached its crisis in the world-war.

The Russian mobilisation took from the statesmen the possibility of healing, and gave the decision into the hands of the military powers. Public opinion in all the countries of our adversaries is resounding with the crimes which Germany is said to have committed in the war. Here also we are ready to confess the wrong that may have been done. We have not come here to belittle the responsibility of the men who have waged the war politically and economically, and to deny any crimes which may have been committed against the rights of peoples.

THE WRONG DONE TO BELGIUM.

We repeat the declaration made in the German Reichstag at the beginning of the war—that is to say, a wrong has been done to Belgium, and we are willing to repair it. But in the manner of making war also Germany is not the only guilty one. Every nation knows of deeds of people which the best nationals only remember with regret.

I do not want to answer by reproaches to reproaches, but I ask them to remember when reparation is demanded not to forget the Armistice. It took six

weeks till we got it at last, and six months till we came to know your conditions of peace. Crimes in war may not be excusable, but they are committed in the struggle for victory and in the defence of national existence, and passions are aroused which make the conscience of peoples blunt.

VICTIMS OF THE BLOCKADE.

The hundreds of thousands of non-combatants who have perished since the 11th of November by reason of the blockade were killed with cold deliberation after our adversaries had conquered and victory had been assured to them. Think of that when you speak of guilt and of punishment.

The measure of guilt of all those who have taken part can only be stated by an impartial inquest before a neutral commission, before which all the principal persons of the tragedy are allowed to speak and to whom all the archives are open. We have demanded such an inquest, and we repeat this demand again at this Conference, where we stand facing our adversaries alone and without any Allies.

We are not quite without protection. You yourselves have brought us an Ally—namely, the right, which is guaranteed by the Treaty, in the principles of the peace. The Allied and associated Governments forswore in the time between the 5th of October and the 5th of November, 1918, a peace of violence, and wrote "A peace of justice" on their banner.

RELYING ON WILSONIAN PRINCIPLES.

On October 5, 1918, the German Government proposed the principles of the President of the United States of North America as the basis of peace, and on the 5th of November their Secretary of State, Mr. Lansing, declared that the Allied and associated Powers agreed to this basis with two definite deviations. The principles of President Wilson have thus become binding for both parties to the war—you as well as for us, and also for our former Allies. The various principles demand from us heavy national and economic sacrifices, but the holy fundamental rights of all peoples are protected by this treaty. The conscience of the world is behind it. There is no nation which might violate it without punishment.

NEW AIMS OF SOCIAL PROGRESS.

You will find us ready to examine upon this basis the preliminary peace which you have proposed to us with a firm intention of re-building in common with you that which has been destroyed, and of repairing any wrong to Belgium—any wrong that may have been committed—principally the wrong to Belgium,—and to show to mankind new aims of political and social progress.

Considering the tremendous number of problems which arise, we ought as soon as possible to make an examination of the principal tasks by special commissions of experts on the basis of the Treaty which you have proposed to us. In this it will be our chief task to re-establish the devastated vigour of mankind and of all the people who have taken part by an international protection of the life, health, and liberty of the working classes.

BELGIUM AND NORTHERN FRANCE.

As our next aim I consider the reconstruction of the territories of Belgium and of Northern France, which have been occupied by us, and which have been destroyed by war. To do so, we have taken upon ourselves a solemn obligation, and we are resolved to execute it to the extent which will have been agreed upon between us.

In this task we cannot do without the co-operation of our former adversaries. We cannot accomplish the work without the technical and financial participation of the victorious peoples, and you cannot execute it without us. Impoverished Europe must desire that the reconstruction should be fulfilled with the greatest success and with as little delay as is in any way possible.

This desire can only be fulfilled by a clear understanding about the best methods to be employed. It would be the worst method to go on and have the work done by German prisoners of war. Certainly this work is cheap, but it would cost the world dear if hatred and despair should seize the German people, when they consider that their brothers and sons and fathers who are prisoners are kept prisoners beyond the preliminary peace doing the former penal work.

Without any immediate solution of this question, which has been drawn out too long, we cannot come to a durable peace. Our experts of both sides will have to examine how the German people may come up to their financial obligations to

repair without succumbing under the heavy burden. A crash would bereave those who have a right to reparation of the advantages to which they have a claim, and would draw after it an irretrievable disorder of the whole European economical system. The vanquishers as well as the vanquished people must guard against this menacing danger, with its incalculable consequences.

THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

There is only one means of banishing it—unlimited confession of the economical and social solidarity of all peoples in a free and rising League of Nations. Gentlemen, the sublime thought to be derived from the most terrible disaster in the history of mankind is the League of Nations; the greatest progress in the development of mankind has been pronounced, and will make its way. Only if the gates of the League of Nations are thrown open to all who are of goodwill can the aim be attained, and only then the dead of this war will not have died in vain.

The German people in their hearts are ready to take upon themselves their heavy lot if the bases of peace which have been established are not any more shaken. The peace which cannot be defined in the name of right before the world always calls forth new resistances against it. Nobody will be capable of subscribing to it with a good conscience, for it will not be possible of fulfilment. Nobody could take upon himself the guarantee of its execution, which ought to lie in its signature. We shall examine the document handed to us with goodwill, and in the hope that the final result of our interview may be subscribed to by all of us.

GERMAN COUNTER PROPOSALS.

PART I.

The first part of the German comments contains general remarks.

CHAPTER I.—THE LEGAL BASIS OF PEACE.

The German Delegates state that they entered upon their task with the conviction that the contents of the Treaty of Peace have in principle been outlined by the events preceding it.

They then recapitulate the interchange of communications with President Wilson, between October 5, 1918, and the Armistice on November 11. As a result of these they consider that Germany as a basis of Peace has expressly accepted President Wilson's Fourteen Points and nothing else. The acceptance of the terms of the Armistice was to be evidence for the honest acceptance of these conditions by Germany. This evidence has been furnished. The Allies also have accepted President Wilson's Fourteen Points, and a solemn agreement as to the basis of Peace therefore exists between the two contracting parties. Germany has a right to this basis, and the Allies, by forsaking it, would break an International legal agreement. But the practical application of the principles must be negotiated upon, and Germany has a right to discussion.

CHAPTER II.—CONTRADICTIONS.

Chapter II. deals at length with the alleged contradictions between the draft of the Treaty and this agreed basis, taken in connection with previous assurances of the statesmen of the Entente. The Delegates point out that their enemies have repeatedly professed that they were not making war against the German people, but against an imperialistic and irresponsible Government. But the Conditions of Peace are an obvious contradiction to such assurances.

Speeches of Mr. Asquith, Lord Robert Cecil, Mr. Winston Churchill, and President Wilson are quoted, as proving that the war was not intended to be against the German people. To-day, however, the Allied Powers are facing not an irresponsible German Government, but the German people ruling its own future for itself. This has been utterly disregarded in the draft Treaty, and it cannot be imagined what harder terms could have been imposed upon an imperialistic Government.

Again, it was affirmed that the Peace to be concluded with Germany was to be a Peace of Right, and not of Might. To this effect speeches of M. Painlevé, M. Pichon, Mr. Winston Churchill, Mr. Balfour, Mr. Bonar Law, Mr. Lloyd George, and President Wilson are quoted.

But the Peace Treaty shows that none of these solemn assurances have been kept. The purely German territory of the Saar is to be separated from the German Empire for at least 15 years. The line of demarcation for a *plébiscite* in Schleswig

has been traced through purely German districts and goes further than Denmark herself wished. In the East, Upper Silesia is to be separated from Germany and conveyed to Poland, though it has had no political connection with Poland for 750 years. The province of Posen and most of West Prussia are to be separated from Germany, though millions of Germans are living there. The Memel district is also to be separated in order to cut off Germany economically from Russia. East Prussia is to be isolated from the Empire; the purely German city of Danzig is to become a free city.

The settlement of the colonial question is equally unjust. Germany has a natural claim to colonies from her culture and undeniable colonial accomplishments.

Further provisions are equally contrary to a Peace of Right, such as those insisting that Germany should recognise beforehand Treaties which may be entered into by her enemies with the States formerly part of the Russian Empire. The economic provisions for the liquidation of German property within the territories of the Allies, the claim that German citizens must be handed over to Courts of the hostile powers, the insistence on Germany acknowledging her responsibility for all damage incurred by the Governments hostile to her, are all contrary to the innate rights of nations.

Again, as to the League of Nations, Germany had repeatedly been promised that the League of Nations would unite the belligerents, conquerors as well as conquered, to secure the world against future disasters. To this effect speeches are quoted by Mr. Asquith, Lord Robert Cecil, Lord Grey, M. Ribot, and President Wilson.

All these utterances made it a matter of course that Germany would from the beginning take part in establishing the League of Nations; but the statute of the League has been established without German help, and Germany is not even invited to join the League. Germany's importance is independent of her temporary military or political position. If she is not admitted it is impossible to speak of a League of Nations.

The enemies of Germany have repeatedly assured the whole world that they do not aim at the destruction of Germany. Speeches to this effect by Mr. Lloyd George, Lord Milner, M. Pichon, and President Wilson are quoted.

But the proposed Treaty of Peace shows that Germany's position as a world power is to be destroyed in every possible manner. Economic provisions are cited to prove the intended destruction of German economic life, both at home and abroad, even to the detail of the confiscation of her cables.

During the war a new principle has been put forward—the right of self-determination of nations. Speeches proclaiming this principle, by Mr. Asquith, Mr. Churchill, Lord Grey, Mr. Lloyd George, Signor Orlando, M. Pichon, and President Wilson, are quoted or alluded to.

But the treatment of the inhabitants of the Saar region and of the districts of Eupen, Malmédy, and Moresnet does not comply with such a solemn recognition of this right. The same is true about Alsace-Lorraine, the cession of which, without consulting the population, would be a new wrong.

If two-and-a-half million Germans are to be torn away from their native land against their own will, this cannot be considered compatible with self-determination. Statistics are given with regard to a number of districts in Central and Upper Silesia and in South-East Prussia to prove that the majority of the populations is German.

The cession of Danzig and of Memel is claimed to be equally contrary to the principles laid down, as is the refusal to allow the German Austrians to unite with Germany, and the compulsion exercised on millions of Germans to remain part of the newly-created Czecho-Slovak State. Even in Germany itself the right of self-determination is denied by the nomination of an alien Commission to carry out the conditions of the Treaty, a surrender of its independence which may not be inflicted upon any State.

CHAPTER III.—RESULTS.

A brief third chapter deals with the results of the Draft. The Delegates claim that it involves the utter destruction of German economic life, and leaves the German people to a financial slavery of a kind unknown in history. The Delegates point out that this would first make itself felt in the sphere of economics, for Germany's creditors could not obtain the immense sums required from a pauperised country. The elimination of Germany from the world's trade might get rid of a troublesome competitor, but the world, already impoverished by the war, would become infinitely poorer.

The world now requires an international community of Labour, to which Germany agrees. But the proposed Treaty is merely a celebration of the last triumph of Imperialist and capitalist tendencies. The Delegates appeal to the innate right of men and nations; the proposed Treaty is incompatible with respect for this innate right; but in the resolve to fulfil her obligations Germany makes the counter-proposals which follow.

PART II.

GERMAN PROPOSALS.

CHAPTER I.—THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

A lasting Peace can only be obtained by way of a League of Nations which guarantees equal rights for the great and small Powers. Germany has already submitted its own proposals for such a League, but the Delegation is prepared to negotiate on the basis of the Allied proposals if Germany is admitted on equal terms as soon as Peace has been signed. At the same time clauses must be inserted, guaranteeing complete equality in trade conditions and freedom from external interference and preventing economic warfare and exclusion by boycott.

Germany is prepared to agree to the basic idea of army, navy, and air regulations (contained in Section V. of the Treaty), and especially to the abolition of compulsory military service, provided this is the beginning of a general reduction of armaments and abandonment of compulsory military service. Their own readiness to reduce armaments at once is a proof of their sincerity. But a period of transition must be allowed during which Germany may retain such forces as are required to preserve internal order before reducing her army to the hundred thousand limit. On condition that Germany enters the League at once she will dismantle the fortresses in the West, and establish a neutral zone, but no special supervision of the process of disarmament, except that of the League, can be admitted, and an extension of time must be granted after discussion on a basis of equality.

Under the proviso of a financial arrangement, Germany is prepared to surrender not only the surface warships demanded, but all ships of the line. Germany is also prepared to accept all general regulations of the League as regards aviation.

Immediate oral negotiations to settle details are proposed. Germany is prepared to do everything in her power to preserve humanity from another war, and if the nations are disappointed in their hope of this it will not be her fault.

CHAPTER II.—TERRITORIAL QUESTIONS.

Chapter II. deals with territorial questions. The first section lays down the principle of the right of self-determination in accordance with President Wilson's four points in his speech of February 11, 1918, and the second point in his speech of July 8, 1918. The German Delegates claim that on these principles the cession of Upper Silesia and the Saar district cannot be demanded at all, and that where territorial cession can be acquiesced in it must be preceded in every case by a plebiscite with universal suffrage under fair conditions administered by a neutral Power after evacuation of foreign troops. Further proposals are made as to the exchange of enclaves and the fixing of frontiers.

This section also advocates the principle of protection of national minorities under the League, including such German minorities as may pass under alien sovereignty. These must be afforded the fullest possible cultural autonomy.

The second section deals with Belgium. It claims that the contested territories of Moresnet and Prussian Moresnet have a German majority. Eupen again is purely German, and the Walloons are considerably in a minority in Malmédy. Germany cannot consent in principle to the cession of such indisputably German districts, and in these instances a real plebiscite is not provided for. Germany is prepared to supply wood from the Eupen forests in reparation to Belgium, but cannot consent to the bartering of human beings.

The brief third section on Luxembourg declares that the proposed economic and political conditions are one-sided and inadmissible.

The fourth section deals at considerable length with the Saar district. Germany declares that the frontiers have been drawn to include important industrial districts beyond the coalmines, but even the cession of the mining district could not be admitted. A supply of coal can be guaranteed; but the total coal computed to exist in the Saar mines would represent a hundred times the maximum French demands.

The population of the Saar district is peculiarly uniform and has been attached to Germany for over a thousand years, during which period France has possessed it for not more than 68 years. The people to-day are as German as they were a hundred years ago, when they demanded to be reunited with Germany, but on account of the coalmines they are put under an abnormal and unfavourable form of government; and since the Armistice they have begun to learn what they will have to suffer.

All this is to compensate France for the coal destroyed in the north; but such a question can only be settled on an economic basis, not by tearing away a nationally undisputed territory and degrading the League of Nations by involving it in the transaction.

The German Government declines to make any reparation in the form of punishment, and still more emphatically declines to pass on to individual parts of the population the punishment intended for the whole of the community. The annexation of the Saar district to France would mean the creation of another Alsace-Lorraine, and Germany claims that the whole question must be reconsidered.

The fifth section, dealing with Alsace-Lorraine, insists that for the most part this district is German, but admits that according to present conceptions of right an injustice was committed in 1871 when the people were not consulted. Germany has, therefore, promised reparation, but it would be no reparation to cede Alsace-Lorraine with its immensely increased economic wealth to France at once.

A vote must be taken allowing a choice between union with France, union with Germany as a free State, and complete independence. Even if the population should decide for France, the present conditions must be modified as to the dating back of the cession and the question of nationality; and if France is to take over the results of German effort she must equally take over a proportionate share in the German debt.

A short sixth section declares that Germany has never intended to shift the frontier with Austria by force, but cannot pledge herself to oppose a possible desire of German-Austria to be united with her.

A long and important seventh section deals with Germany's eastern frontiers. Germany has agreed to the creation of an independent Polish State, but the terms of the Treaty include in it a number of totally German towns and extensive German tracts of land for military or economic reasons, without regard to nationality or to history.

It is claimed that this particularly applies to Upper Silesia, which has had no connection with the Polish Empire since 1163. The wishes of the inhabitants have been clearly expressed by the elections of the Reichstag in 1903 and 1907, when the majority voted for German rather than Polish deputies. In 1919, when the Poles proclaimed their abstention from voting, 60 per cent. of possible voters voted for German candidates.

With regard to language, the parents of less than 22 per cent. of the school children have declared themselves in favour of education in a non-German language under the new provisions, and the Polish dialect spoken by a considerable part of the Upper Silesians is really a mixed language, and does not represent a mark of nationality.

Upper Silesia owes everything to Germany, and Germany cannot dispense with Upper Silesia, while Poland does not really need it. The Upper Silesian coal has supplied almost the whole industry of Eastern Germany, and last year the output was 43,500,000 metric tons. Poland at the same period used about 10,500,000 tons, and the Polish output was nearly 7,000,000. Half the deficit came from Upper Silesia, the remainder from the mines now in Czecho-Slovakia, but the new Poland could probably supply herself with all the coal she needs.

German conditions for working-class life are incomparably better than those in Poland, and the cession of Upper Silesia, to which Germany cannot consent, would be as disadvantageous to its own population as to the rest of mankind.

The province of Posen cannot be regarded as indisputably Polish. Germany is prepared to cede such parts as are truly Polish, but the proposed frontiers are based on obsolete strategic, not national, considerations.

As to West Prussia, the Treaty gives almost the whole of it, and even a part of Pomerania, to Poland. West Prussia is claimed as old German territory on which the Polish dominion of 300 years has left little trace. In the district assigned directly or indirectly to Poland, it is claimed that the population includes about 744,000 Germans against 580,000 Poles and Cassubians (who are not to be identified with the Poles), and the German population is of far greater economic and cultural importance.

Germany cannot consent to the severance of East Prussia, with its German population of a million and a half, from the German Empire. A connecting bridge must absolutely be preserved, but Germany is ready to cede to Poland such West Prussian territories as are indisputably Polish.

The cession of Danzig, a purely German town, is claimed to be in direct opposition with President Wilson's principles. To make it a free city and to surrender certain of its rights to Poland would lead to violent opposition and a continuous state of war in the East. Danzig must remain with the German Empire. But Germany is ready to make Memel, Königsberg, and Danzig free ports in order to secure to Poland the promised access to the sea, and to grant special transit facilities under specified conditions reciprocally applied.

In the southern parts of East Prussia a plebiscite is demanded; but these districts are not indisputably Polish, and the fact that a non-German language is spoken in certain regions is in itself of no importance.

With regard to Memel and the adjoining districts, even the Lithuanian-speaking inhabitants have never shown any desire to separate from Germany, and the Delegates state that in the whole territory there are about 68,000 Germans, as against about 54,000 Lithuanian-speaking inhabitants, who generally also speak German. Memel in particular is claimed as a purely German town, and Germany therefore declines to cede this territory.

If any German territory is ultimately ceded to Poland, Germany must protect its former nationals. This is all the more necessary because the Poles have not so far shown themselves trustworthy protectors of the national and religious rights of minorities.

The Germans further protest against the regulations as to change of nationality, and against the lack of security for German interests in the districts affected; and they demand a Commission to assess damages caused by recent Polish disturbances.

In the eighth section the German Delegates agree to the holding of a plebiscite in Schleswig, although this point was not mentioned by President Wilson. They protest, however, against the delimitation of the voting districts, and propose another boundary and a different system of voting and control for the plebiscite.

A short ninth section accepts the dismantling of Heligoland, but insists on any measure necessary for the protection of the coast and port in the interest of the population.

The tenth section deals with the colonies. The Delegates maintain that the demand that Germany should relinquish all her rights and claims is an irreconcilable contradiction of Point 5 of President Wilson's address to Congress of January 8, 1918, which promised a free, sincere, and impartial settlement of colonial claims.

Germany's claim is based on the fact that she has acquired them lawfully and developed them laboriously. The possession of them will be even more necessary to her in the future than in the past, as, owing to the low rate of exchange, she must obtain raw material from her own colonies. She further requires her colonies as a market, and as settlements for a part of her surplus population.

As a great civilised nation, the German people have the right to co-operate in the joint task of mankind, in which they have already achieved great things. The interests of the coloured population of the colonies speak for Germany remaining in possession of them, for the German administration has abolished abuses and introduced peace, order, justice, health, education, and Christianity.

Germany has clearly looked after the interests of the natives. She has refrained from militarising them, and has adhered to the principle of the open door. The demand that the colonies should be renounced is, therefore, considered unjustified.

Without modifying this position, the Delegates further point out that the conditions under which the cession is demanded are unacceptable in detail, particularly as to State and private property and compensation; and they claim that any mandatory Power should pay all expenses incurred by the German Empire, and that the territory should still be responsible for liabilities incurred.

They therefore make a counter-proposal that an impartial hearing of the colonial question should take place before a special Committee.

Germany claims that though justified in demanding the restoration of her colonies, she is ready to administer them according to the principles of the League of Nations if a League is formed which she can enter at once as a member with equal privileges.

The eleventh section agrees to the renunciation of German rights and privileges regarding Kiao-chau and Shantung with certain stipulations as to compensation.

Section twelve deals with Russia and the Russian States. Germany does not claim or propose to interfere with any territory which belonged to the former Russian Empire. The Peace of Brest-Litovsk has already been renounced in the Armistice.

But Germany cannot recognise any right on the part of Russia to demand restitution and reparation, and it is only able to recognise the relevant Treaties and Agreements if their contents are known, and if they do not prove to be unacceptable.

CHAPTER III.—GERMAN RIGHTS OUTSIDE EUROPE.

The German Delegates complain that according to the draft Treaty, Germany is to have no rights whatever in Europe, outside her own frontiers.

If Germany is to continue to exist, the realisation of these terms is impossible. Germany must have the use of shipping, but she is called upon to deliver up her entire overseas fleet with all tonnage which happened to be in enemy harbours at the beginning of the war. Further, the Allies refuse to recognise the decisions of German prize courts, or to consider German claims for damages, while German sea-ports are deliberately weakened by a number of claims so that a reconstructed German mercantile fleet will encounter totally unfair conditions in traffic.

The German submarine cables are to be taken away. Germany's foreign trade is to be excluded from all kinds of activity. Germany is called upon to violate the Egyptian right to self-determination by recognising the British Protectorate. All concessions and privileges acquired in Russia since August, 1914, are annulled, and many other foreign rights are left in jeopardy. The Allies have proposed economic and financial provisions which put Germany under a continued disadvantage, and they reserve to themselves the right to take exceptional war measures in regard to German rights, properties, and interests abroad, so that German citizens will be placed in an unbearable state of uncertainty.

The German Delegates cannot reconcile such provisions with the principles of impartial justice. They may offer great advantages to rival merchants, but they do nothing towards repairing the damage which Germany has undertaken to make good. It is only natural that the German people should now believe that the Allies intend to stamp out German commercial competition. The German Delegates lay great stress on the necessity of granting full and reciprocal freedom of action whenever possible, and outline the proposals repeated in the following chapter.

CHAPTER IV.—REPARATION.

Germany accepts the obligation to pay for all damages sustained by the civil populations in the occupied parts of Belgium and France, inasmuch as she brought upon them the terrors of war by a breach of international law through the violation of Belgian neutrality. She opposes reparation to other occupied territories in Italy, Montenegro, Serbia, Rumania, and Poland, as no attack in contradiction to international law was involved. She voluntarily concedes responsibility for Belgian loans, but claims that the Allies have far exceeded in the categories of damages named in the draft Treaty the agreements entered into at the Armistice, especially in holding Germany responsible for losses to civilians outside the occupied territories, to the States themselves, to military persons, and in losses caused by Germany's allies.

Germany contests certain specific responsibilities, particularly as to the costs of an army of occupation, which she considers both unnecessary and uneconomic. She cannot accept the Reparation Commission as outlined, as the giving of such dictatorial powers would mean a renunciation of sovereignty. The Commission would be both party and judge, and the greater part of the reparation could only be collected by force. A German Commission is therefore proposed for co-operation with this Commission, any disagreement to be finally decided by a mixed Court of Arbitration under neutral presidency.

Germany is anxious to co-operate in the restoration of France and Belgium, to which end proposals will shortly be made. She recognises the principle that her taxation shall be not less heavy than any Allied State, but predicates her whole attitude as to reparations upon the acceptance of her general proposals, on the ground that she can bear the heavy burdens imposed only if her territory is not divided up, her industrial as well as her food basis not destroyed, and her overseas

connections, colonies, and mercantile fleet retained. Also territories separated from her should pay their proportionate share of the war debt.

Germany agrees to issue, four weeks after Peace, Government bonds for 20 billion marks gold [£1,000,000,000], payable before May 1, 1926, and for the remainder of the reparations to draw up deeds for annual payments without interest, beginning May 1, 1927, the total not to exceed 100 billion marks [£5,000,000,000], including repayments to Belgium, deliveries of materials during the Armistice, and other concessions required. The annuity to be paid each year is to be fixed as a distinct percentage of Germany's revenue, that for the first 16 years not to exceed a billion marks [£50,000,000] annually.

Ton for ton replacement of shipping cannot be accepted, as this is entirely beyond Germany's reduced production power, and would destroy the German economic system. She agrees, nevertheless, to construct an even greater tonnage, and over a longer period than stipulated. The demand for the surrender of fishing vessels is impossible owing to their supreme value for the food supply of Germany, and especially as 146 of the 210 fishing boats are demanded. The surrender of the whole overseas merchant fleet is unacceptable, and not over 10 per cent. of the river tonnage can be given over.

Germany acknowledges the principle of placing her resources directly in the service of reparation, but only in so far as not to infringe on her economic sovereignty. To this end they propose a German Commission parallel to the Reparations Commission, the two to work out details in co-operation. The requisition of materials shall be carried out, however, in such a way as to avoid the disorganisation of German economic life; restitutions must be made first of all from free stocks; the time limits in certain instances must be increased.

Germany agrees, if her situation permits, to export to France coal equal to the difference occasioned by the destruction of the French mines, the maximum to be 20 million tons for the first five years and five million tons thereafter. In order, however, to expedite the reconstruction of the French mines, Germany asks to be allowed to devote her skill to this work. She is unable to accord the options for coal demanded owing to decreased production, but is willing to agree to a priority on the surplus over the German inland requirements of the next ten years, to meet the requirements of France and Belgium. In return, Germany expects adequate supplies of minerals for her smelting work from Lorraine and France. As to coal deprivations, decreased production makes it possible to deliver only a portion of that demanded.

Germany agrees to the option demanded as to dyestuffs and chemical drugs, though refusing to accept price control by the Commission as involving a surrender of business secrets wholly unwarranted. A continuing option until 1925 is refused as impairing Germany's financial capacity.

In a final paragraph Germany states that shortage of time has made it impossible to give an exhaustive statement, and therefore proposes oral negotiations, with the suggestion that she has in mind ways of reparation possibly not considered by the Allies, especially the compensation of owners of destroyed industrial undertakings by the transference to them of proportionate shares in similar undertakings in Germany.

CHAPTER V.—REGULATIONS CONCERNING COMMERCIAL POLICY.

Germany demands that the economic provisions of the Treaty be drawn up with full regard of the perfect equality of rights of Germany with those of other nations. She states that every creditor has the greatest interest in keeping his debtor solvent, although her strength has already been greatly impaired through an illegal blockade. She can only bear her burdens and regain a position equal to that of other nations if economic freedom similar to that before the war be granted her. She therefore insists upon immediate admission to the League of Nations with the economic advantages proposed in her draft, and suggests an unrestricted grant for a certain number of years of mutual most-favoured-nation treatment instead of the one-sided rights provided in the Treaty Draft. Similarly, she proposes that all nations in the present unsettled state of the world retain full freedom as to tariffs, which would be especially desirable in her case, in order to facilitate reparation. Questions as to the certificates of vessels, navigation, unfair competition, industrial, literary, and artistic property, and the international law of traffic, could be settled through the League of Nations, by special agreements or at an international conference. She agrees not to discriminate against Allied goods

going by rail or vessel, but rejects interference with her internal railway and traffic organisations.

CHAPTER VI.—INTERNAL NAVIGATION

The control of German river system by International Commissions, in which Germany in no case is to have a majority, gives an economically unlimited authority over Germany's internal waterways and indirectly over German railways. This would have a decisive influence on the internal regulation of Germany's whole economic life incompatible with Germany's sovereignty, and therefore impossible. Germany agrees, however, to revise existing conventions to meet new conditions and open up German rivers to the utmost extent to the traffic of all nations, subject to the principle that riparian States alone are to participate in the administration.

As to the Elbe, she agrees to take the utmost account of the needs of Czecho-Slovakia; for the Rhine, she believes the Central Commission adequate, but is willing to accept negotiations for improvement; for the Danube, she demands representation on both Commissions; for the Oder, a purely German river, she states that no Commission is necessary; for the Vistula, she is willing to enter into negotiations with Poland, and for the Niemen, with other riparian States. She is unwilling to accept, except after more detailed negotiation, the arrangements placing Strasburg and Kehl under a single administration, or those dealing with the Rhine bridges and works for producing water-power.

As to the use of Hamburg and Stettin by Czecho-Slovakia, she is willing to negotiate a separate treaty to this end, and also to enter into negotiations as to how interested States may obtain a proportional share of the river tonnage beyond that surrendered under reparations. The Kiel Canal can be open to the traffic of all nations under conditions of reciprocity, though the International Commission proposal is acceptable only if other straits are similarly treated.

CHAPTER VII.—TREATIES.

While unable in the short time available to check the completeness of the list of multilateral arrangements enumerated in the Draft Treaty as becoming operative again, Germany believes it preferable in principle for all multilateral treaties in force at the outbreak of war to come into force again at the Peace, a later examination to decide which of them should be altered or terminated.

The provision to accept in advance future arrangements made by the Allies as to international postal, telegraphic, and wireless traffic is held incompatible with the dignity of an independent people. An energetic protest is raised against the provision giving the Allies the exclusive right to decide which of the bilateral treaties in force before the war shall be revised. Instead, each party should be free to inform the other of any provisions which have become inoperative, the settlement to be arrived at by special commissions.

Germany notes that treaties with States not at war with her—as Peru, Bolivia, Equador, and Uruguay—are not affected by the rupture of diplomatic relations; refuses to accept the general abrogation of engagements with her former Allies and Russia and Rumania, as threatening the ordered relations with those countries, and declines to give the Allies certain advantages secured to her own allies and neutrals until she has had time to examine them in full, after which special negotiations are proposed.

CHAPTER VIII.—PRISONERS OF WAR AND GRAVES.

Germany requests the release of prisoners of war and interned civilians convicted of a crime or offence committed during their confinement in a hostile State. She also demands a full reciprocity of treatment for such prisoners and for the care of graves, and consents to bear only such expenses for prisoners of war and interned civilians as are incurred after they have left the territory of the enemy Power.

CHAPTER IX.—PENALTIES.

As to the trial of the ex-Kaiser, Germany cannot recognise the justification of such criminal prosecution, which is not founded upon any legal basis, or agree to the competence of the special tribunal proposed, or the admissibility of the surrender to be requested of the Netherlands. She cannot admit that a German be placed before a special foreign tribunal, to be convicted as a consequence of an exceptional law promulgated by foreign Powers only against him, on principles, not of right, but of politics, and to be punished for an action which was not punishable at the

time it was committed. Nor can she consent to a request being addressed to Holland to surrender a German to a foreign Power for such unjustifiable proceedings.

As to the surrender of persons accused of violations of the laws and customs of war for trial by a military tribunal, even when proceedings have already been begun by German courts, Germany is forbidden by her criminal code to make such extradition of German subjects to foreign Governments. Germany again declares her preparedness to see that violations of international law are punished with full severity, and suggests that the preliminary question as to whether such an offence has been committed be submitted to an international tribunal of competent neutrals to judge all violations by subjects of all the signatories, Germany to have her share in the formation of this tribunal, and the meting out of punishment to be left to the national courts.

CHAPTER X.—LABOUR.

The conditions of Peace start from the standpoint that the interests of the working-classes are not to be decided by the workers themselves, but are to remain the concern of their Governments. Moreover, since Germany is not immediately accepted as a member of the League of Nations and the Organisation of Labour, the German people are to be excluded from co-operation in determining the rights and duties upon which the health and welfare of the workers depend, although Germany's labour legislation has become a model for the entire world. The Peace conditions destroy all the progress which the German workers have made and submit them to extreme distress and exploitation.

Such a Peace would be concluded at the expense of the working-classes in all countries. Consequently, the German workers can only agree to a Peace which embodies the immediate aims of the international labour movement, and which does not sacrifice all their achievements in favour of alien oppressors. A solemn protest is, therefore, made against even a temporary exclusion of Germany from the Organisation of Labour. The Allied and Associated Governments possess no right to inflict damage upon German workers by the exercise of wilful and irresponsible power. A Peace which does not bestow equal rights upon working-men would be based upon quicksand. The Peace terms are lacking in the first essentials for the recognition of equal rights of workers of all lands.

Germany once more proposes the summoning of a conference of labour organisations to discuss the Allied proposals, the German counter-proposals, and the Berne resolutions of February, the result to be embodied in the Treaty of Peace and to attain thereby the force of international law. Any other settlement would signify a violation of fundamental human rights which the conscience of the world dare not allow.

CHAPTER XI.—GUARANTEES.

Even in the provisions for its execution the Peace Conditions do not renounce the principle of force. As a guarantee for the fulfilment of conditions which strike such a terrible blow at the life of the German people, an occupation of German territory, extending over many years, is demanded, obviously to provide security against German aggression and as a guarantee against a refusal by Germany to fulfil her obligations. No human being, however, could possibly consider that the German people weakened as they are, could be seduced to the madness of an aggressive war, which could only mean utter annihilation. Better guarantees of the fulfilment of the economic and financial obligations could be afforded.

Whereas the occupation of the German Rhenish territory strikes a particularly hard blow at Germany, it also renders the payment of reparations most difficult or absolutely impossible, as large sums would have to be spent by Germany for the upkeep of the army and the free economic life within Germany would be broken up. The occupation would deprive the German authorities of the control of the administration, economic life, and ways of communication, including the Rhine, and permit the continuance of the right of requisition which is permissible only in war. Moreover, a special customs tariff could be introduced for the occupied territory, which might cut off this territory economically from the motherland, and bring it under the influence of Belgium and France.

Germany, therefore, expects that the territory which has been occupied by the terms of the Armistice shall be evacuated not later than six months after the signing of the Peace Treaty, and that during this time the occupation shall be restricted and most exclusively military.

Up to now the world has failed to give due consideration to the great transformation which has taken place in the national life of Germany. Through the will of her people Germany has become a democracy and a Republic. The new Germany is convinced that it deserves the confidence of its neighbours and that it may therefore demand its place in the League of Nations, which in itself would constitute the most inviolable guarantee of good faith.

However little Germany is in a position to exercise pressure in bringing about a Peace which alone can be permanent, it would be remiss in its duty if it did not once more raise its voice in warning against the consequences of a Peace of brute force. The fate of Russia, indeed, speaks in unmistakable terms. The utterly exhausted German people is struggling desperately to preserve the country from the final dissolution of all its constituent elements. The outcome of this battle, which is now being fought with its last remaining strength, will be determined almost exclusively by the form which the Treaty of Peace assumes.

A Permanent Peace can never be established upon the oppression and enslavement of a great nation. Only a return to the immutable principles of morality and civilisation and the sanctity of treaties would render it possible for mankind to continue to exist. In the very moment of founding a new commonwealth based upon liberty and labour the German people turns to those who have been its enemies and demands in the interests of all nations and of all human beings a Peace to which it may give its assent in accordance with the dictates of its conscience.

LEGAL SUPPLEMENT.

A supplement contains comments on special legal questions. These are for the most part of a detailed and technical character and hardly lend themselves to summarising.

The first section deals with the resumption of diplomatic and consular relations. The second section deals at great length with the treatment of private rights, which the Delegates claim to be unfair owing to the lack of reciprocity. The German Delegates have no fundamental objection to the proposed Clearing House system, but they insist that it must be applied reciprocally and that the private parties concerned should retain full powers of disposition.

A number of detailed criticisms and demands for fuller explanation are appended.

A protest is entered against the alleged anticipations of the signature of the Peace Treaty by the Allied Powers in France, Belgium, China, and elsewhere, and among the special criticisms which follow is a claim that the differentiation between the property of former German Sovereigns and that of any other German is unjustifiable.

Further protests deal in some detail with the articles in the Treaty concerning contracts, mixed courts of arbitration, and the protection of industrial property, with regard to which its claim that the restrictions on German industrial property are unbearable owing to their weakening of German economic strength is one of the few fields in which reconstruction might be attempted.

The third section, which is much shorter, deals with the special provisions affecting maritime law and prize courts, which are claimed to be intolerable and unjustifiable.

The fourth and final section deals with criminal law. In this connection the German Delegates propose that each Power should grant the nationals of the other party immunity for all criminal acts committed in the course of the war for the benefit of their own country, with the exception of acts infringing the laws and customs of war.

FINANCIAL SUPPLEMENT.

Another supplement contains the comments of the Finance Commission of the German Delegation. These cover much the same ground as the corresponding section of the main comments, but at greater length.

Two further short notes have been issued by the German Delegates, dealing with special points in Section IX., Finance, of the Peace Treaty, chiefly in reference to Turkey and Brazil.

II. PROTESTS BY GENERAL SMUTS.

Following the signature of the Treaty, General Smuts issued the following manifesto:—

“General Smuts has issued the following statement for publication:—

“I have signed the Peace Treaty, not because I consider it a satisfactory document, but because it is imperatively necessary to close the war; because the world needs peace above all, and nothing could be more fatal than the continuance of the state of suspense between war and peace. The months since the armistice was signed have perhaps been as upsetting, unsettling, and ruinous to Europe as the previous four years of war. I look upon the Peace Treaty as the close of those two chapters of war and armistice, and only on that ground do I agree to it.

“I say this now, not in criticism, but in faith; not because I wish to find fault with the work done, but rather because I feel that in the Treaty we have not yet achieved the real peace to which our peoples were looking, and because I feel that the real work of making peace will only begin after this Treaty has been signed, and a definite halt has thereby been called to the destructive passions that have been desolating Europe for nearly five years. This Treaty is simply the liquidation of the war situation in the world.

“The promise of the new life, the victory of the great human ideals, for which the peoples have shed their blood and their treasure without stint, the fulfilment of their aspirations towards a new international order, and a fairer, better world, are not written in this Treaty, and will not be written in treaties. ‘Not in this mountain, nor in Jerusalem, but in spirit and in truth,’ as the Great Master said, must the foundations of the new order be laid. A new heart must be given, not only to our enemies, but also to us; a contrite spirit for the woes which have overwhelmed the world; a spirit of pity, mercy, and forgetfulness for the sins and wrongs which we have suffered. A new spirit of generosity and humanity, born in the hearts of the peoples in this great hour of common suffering and sorrow, can alone heal the wounds which have been inflicted on the body of Christendom.

“And this new spirit among the peoples will be the solvent for the problems which the statesmen have found too hard at the Conference.

“There are territorial settlements which will need revision.

“There are guarantees laid down, which we all hope will soon be found out of harmony with the new peaceful temper and unarmed state of our former enemies.

“There are punishments foreshadowed, over most of which a calmer mood may yet prefer to pass the sponge of oblivion.

“There are indemnities stipulated, which cannot be exacted without grave injury to the industrial revival of Europe, and which it will be in the interests of all to render more tolerable and moderate.

“There are numerous pin-pricks, which will cease to pain under the healing influences of the new international atmosphere.

“The real peace of the peoples ought to follow, complete, and amend the peace of the statesmen.

“In this Treaty, however, two achievements of far-reaching importance for the world are definitely recorded. The one is the destruction of Prussian militarism; the other is the institution of the League of Nations. I am confident the League of Nations will yet prove the path of escape for Europe out of the ruin brought about by this war.

“But the League is as yet only a form. It still requires the quickening life, which can only come from the active interest and the vitalising contact of the peoples themselves. The new creative spirit, which is once more moving among the peoples in this anguish, must fill the institution with life, and with inspiration for the pacific ideals born of this war, and so convert it into a real instrument of progress. In that way the abolition of militarism, in this Treaty unfortunately confined to the enemy, may soon come as a blessing and relief to the allied peoples as well.

“And the enemy peoples should at the earliest possible date join the League, and in collaboration with the Allied peoples learn to practise the great lesson of this war—that not in separate ambitions or in selfish domination but in common service for the great human cause lies the true path of national progress.

" This joint collaboration is especially necessary to-day for the reconstruction of a ruined and broken world.

" The war has resulted, not only in the utter defeat of the enemy armies, but has gone immeasurably further. We witness the collapse of the whole political and economic fabric of Central and Eastern Europe. Unemployment, starvation, anarchy, war, disease and despair stalk through the land. Unless the victors can effectively extend a helping hand to the defeated and broken peoples, a large part of Europe is threatened with exhaustion and decay. Russia has already walked into the night, and the risk that this rest may follow is very grave indeed.

" The effects of this disaster would not be confined to Central and Eastern Europe. For civilisation is one body, and we are all members of one another.

" A supreme necessity is laid on all to grapple with this situation. And in the joint work of beneficence the old feuds will tend to be forgotten, the roots of reconciliation among the peoples will begin to grow again, and ultimately flower into active, fruitful, lasting Peace.

" To the peoples of the United States and the British Empire, who have been exceptionally blessed with the good things of life, I would make a special appeal. Let them exert themselves to the utmost in this great work of saving the wreckage of life and industry on the Continent of Europe. They have a great mission, and in fulfilling it they will be as much blessed as blessing.

" All this is possible, and I hope capable of accomplishment; but only on two conditions.

" In the first place, the Germans must convince our peoples of their good faith, of their complete sincerity through a real honest effort to fulfil their obligations under the Treaty to the extent of their ability. They will find the British people disposed to meet them halfway in their unexampled difficulties and perplexities. But any resort to subterfuges or to underhand means to defeat or evade the Peace Treaty will only revive old suspicions and rouse anger and prove fatal to a good understanding.

" And, in the second place, our Allied peoples must remember that God gave them overwhelming victory—victory far beyond their greatest dreams, not for small selfish ends, not for financial or economic advantages, but for the attainment of the great human ideals, for which our heroes gave their lives, and which are the real victors in this war of ideals.

On his departure from Europe, General Smuts issued a manifesto which included the following passages:—

" Certain things have to be said to-day, though I find great and general unwillingness to say them. The position I have occupied in this country, and the fact that under very difficult circumstances and in spite of many heart-searchings, both for myself and my people, I have taken a most active part against the Germans from the first to the last day of the late war, give me the right to say them without giving offence to anybody.

" The protest which I issued on signing the Peace Treaty has called forth a vast correspondence which shows a widespread agreement with the views I hold on that document, as well as on the international situation generally. Deep as my disappointment was with many important features of the treaty, I did not protest in bitterness or from any desire to criticise.

" The past is done and must be accepted as a fact; the future is before us to make or mar. And I spoke with an eye to the future, with a desire to create the right spirit wherewith to confront the difficult situation before us.

" In spite of the apparent failure of the Peace Conference to bring about the real and lasting appeasement of the nations to which we had been looking forward, our faith in our great ideals should be kept untarnished. The sting of bitterness should be taken out of the great disillusion which is overtaking the peoples. Instead of sitting down in despair as reactionaries or anarchists we should continue to march forward with firm step as those who have the great hope.

" . . . There must be a real peace between the nations. The word reconciliation has to be writ large on our skies. Our hearts have to be emptied of all

bitterness and hatred, and the memories of war atrocities should not harden our hearts against the revival of a new international life. A new life, a new spirit is imperatively necessary if Europe is not to fall backward and lag behind other continents in the great march of humanity.

"Her lot is indeed pitiable beyond words. The Continent which is the motherland of our civilisation lies in ruins, exhausted by the most terrible struggle in history, with its people broken, starving, despairing, from sheer nervous exhaustion mechanically struggling forward along the paths of anarchy and war, and seeing only red through the blinding mist of tears and fears—almost a mad Continent, more fit for Bedlam than for the tremendous task of reconstruction that lies before it.

"It is the most awful spectacle in history, and no man with any heart or regard for human destiny can contemplate it without the deepest emotion.

"No, it is not a case for hatred or bitterness, but for all-embracing pity, for extending the helping hand to late friend and foe alike, and for a mission of rescue work such as the world has never seen. Europe is and will, for this generation, be the greatest mission field in which the energies of the great-hearted peoples of this country and America could be spent. And the gospel will be that original one of "goodwill among men," of human comradeship beyond the limits of nations, of fellow-feeling and common service in great human causes

"All this applies to Europe generally, but I wish to add a word in reference to Germany and Russia, in particular, as the situation is too grave to permit of any shrinking from the frankest expression of opinion.

"The brutal fact is that Great Britain is a very small island on the fringe of the Continent, and that on that Continent the 70 odd million Germans represent the most important and formidable national factor. You cannot have a stable Europe without a stable, settled Germany, and you cannot have a stable, settled, prosperous Great Britain while Europe is weltering in confusion and unsettlement next door.

"In our policy of European settlement the appeasement of Germany, therefore, becomes one of cardinal importance. We have to-day in Germany a moderate republic, which, in my opinion, deserves encouragement and support from this country. It has done its best to prevent anarchy on the one hand and military reaction on the other, and has done so with more success than I, for one, expected.

"Ebert's republic has been for months standing in the breach fighting the battle of European order against the growing forces of anarchy. The great issue will probably be decided in Germany for good and all. And Ebert deserves our backing and encouragement. Do not let us deal with Ebert as we dealt with Kerensky and Karolyi—with results beyond recall to-day.

"There are whole chapters in the Peace Treaty which are as nothing compared to the supreme importance to this country and to Europe of having a stable, moderate, democratic, republican Germany. In my opinion, we should do our best to give it stability and to recognise it in the family of nations represented on the League.

"Russia is an even more obscure and difficult problem than Germany, and one on which no dogmatic opinion would be justified. But from all the information which has come into my possession, I am seriously doubtful about the sort of policy which we seem to be pursuing there. Russia can only be saved internally by Russians themselves, working on Russian methods and ideas. She is a case of national pathology of a people with a sick soul, and only Russian ideas could work a cure. Our military forces, our lavish contributions of tanks, and other war material may temporarily bolster up the one side, but the real magnitude of the problem is quite beyond such expedients.

"Leave Russia alone, remove the blockade, adopt a policy of friendly neutrality and Galliolike impartiality to all factions.

"It may well be that the only ultimate hope for Russia is a sobered, purified, Soviet system, and that may be far better than the Tsarism to which our present policy seems inevitably tending. If we have to appear on the Russian scene at all, let it be as impartial, benevolent friends and helpers and not as military or political partisans. Be patient with sick Russia, give her time and sympathy, and await the results of her convalescence."

III. LETTER OF MR. WILLIAM C. BULLITT,
FORMERLY ASSISTANT OF THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE, ATTACHED TO THE
AMERICAN COMMISSION TO NEGOTIATE PEACE, TO PRESIDENT WILSON,
MAY, 1919.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT,—I have submitted to-day to the Secretary of State my resignation as assistant of the Department of State attached to the American Commission to negotiate peace. I was one of the millions who trusted confidently and implicitly your leadership, and believed you would take nothing less than a permanent peace based upon unselfish and unbiased justice.

But our Government has consented now to deliver the suffering peoples of the world to new oppressions, subjections and dismemberments—a new century of war.

And I can convince myself no longer that effective labour for “a new world order” is possible as a servant of this Government.

Russia—the acid test of goodwill for me as for you—has not even been understood. The unjust decisions of the Conference in regard to Shantung, the Tyrol, Thrace, Hungary, East Prussia, Danzig, and Saar Valley, and the abandonment of the principle of the freedom of the seas, make new international conflicts certain.

It is my conviction that the present League of Nations will be powerless to prevent these wars, and that the United States will be involved in them by obligations undertaken in the Covenant of the League and the special understanding with France.

Therefore, the duty of the Government of the United States to its own people and to mankind is to refuse to sign or ratify this unjust Treaty, to refuse to guarantee its settlements by entering the League of Nations, to refuse to entangle the United States further by an understanding with France.

That you are personally opposed to most of the unjust settlements, and that you accepted them only under great pressure, is well known. Nevertheless, it is my conviction that if you had made your fight in the open instead of behind closed doors, you would have carried with you the public opinion of the world, which was yours. You would have been able to resist the pressure, and might have established that “new international order based upon broad and universal principles of Right and Justice” of which you used to speak.

I am sorry you did not fight our fight to a finish, and that you had so little faith in the millions of men like myself in every nation who had faith in you.—Very sincerely yours, WILLIAM C. BULLITT.

IV. A BELGIAN PROTEST.

Dr. Charles Sarolea, Belgian Consul at Edinburgh, writes to the *Manchester Guardian* (May 25) as follows:—

As a Belgian by birth, whose household goods have been destroyed, and who has been financially ruined by the deeds of individual Germans, I cannot be accused of any tender feelings for the enemy. . . . I confess that I cannot look upon this world convulsion merely as a kinematic melodrama, with consummate villains on the one side and innocent heroes on the other. . . . Nor is this war rooted only in a few diplomatic and political causes; it is rooted in a hundred and one causes, economic, religious, geographical, as well as political and diplomatic. These causes making for war were operative everywhere. If they were more “dynamic” in Germany, it is mainly because the German people were politically a hundred years behind us whilst economically they were fifty years ahead of us; it is also because the German people were more passionately patriotic than their enemies, and because they practised more consistently the three theological virtues of blind faith, passive obedience, and patient endurance. All the causes suggested made Germany the initiator of *this* war. But those same causes had made other nations initiate within the last generation no less than ten other wars, with none of which “Prussian militarism” had anything to do.

And even assuming Germany and Austria to have been solely responsible for *this* crime, we must acknowledge that Europe generally and Great Britain in particular were in the past the accomplices of “Prussian militarism.” Before 1900 it is Germany and not France which earned our unstinted sympathies. It is Bismarck and not Gambetta who was glorified as the super-statesman. Even our theologians repaired to the German universities as to the fountains of wisdom.

It is true that Prussia stole Poland, but the very Prussian armies which conquered Poland were paid with British subsidies, as Lord Eversley has once more proved. It is true that Prussia stole Slesvig-Holstein, but we connived at the deed. It is true that Germany annexed Alsace-Lorraine, but Great Britain did not utter one word of protest, and Lord Granville and Mr. Gladstone turned a deaf ear to the pathetic appeals of Thiers. It is true that the annexation of Bosnia started the train which led up to the explosion. But Lord Salisbury and Mr. A. J. Balfour were the "loyal secundants" of Bismarck and Andrassy at the Treaty of Berlin, which surrendered Bosnia, and to-day after 41 years Mr. Balfour is only undoing what as a young diplomat he helped to accomplish in 1878. It is true that the alliance of Germany and Austria with Turkey became the cornerstone of Pan-German policy; but that same alliance with Turkey was until recently the cornerstone of our own policy, and it is that alliance which maintained the chaos of the Balkans.

But let us grant that not only Prussia but the whole of Germany is responsible for the crime of the war. What do we mean by the abstraction "Germany"? The Congress of Vienna did distinguish between Napoleon and the French people. Must we not establish a similar distinction? Shall we not say that in the last resort this war was even more a crime against the German people than a crime of the German people? If it be objected that German public opinion was wholly favourable to the war, I reply that there was not, there could not be, an independent public opinion in Germany. We know how easy it is even in a free country like ours to manufacture an artificial public opinion. How much easier in Germany, where the churches and the universities and the banks and the press were in the service of the State. How much easier to hoodwink a docile and disciplined people, a sentimental and a passionate people, carried away by that fiery patriotism which all nations still agree to consider as the highest of all virtues. The German people had not one single word to say in the declaration or initiation of the war. And once war was declared, once Prussia was invaded, how far was it possible even for the Socialists not to submit to military law?

Let us even admit that the German people must pay the penalty of the sins of their own Government, that every nation have the government they deserve, that they therefore must be punished for submitting to the countless atrocities perpetrated by their rulers, even that admission does not settle either our moral or political peace problem. By all means let the innocent Germans suffer *with* the guilty. Unfortunately under the peace settlement it is not the innocent that are suffering *with* the guilty; it is mainly the innocent who are chastised. We are punishing not the past or even the present generation, we are punishing the untold millions of young lads and children who will be reduced by the peace settlement to industrial helotry, who will become hewers of wood and drawers of water for the conquering nations.

V. BRITISH UNIVERSITY MEN.

A letter, signed as under, was addressed to the Press on May 24, pointing out that it was on a promise of settlement on the basis of President Wilson's Fourteen Points that Germany laid down her arms.

It was on all sides anticipated that the peace would embody these points. Instead of this, after six months, during which the maintenance of the blockade has deeply accentuated the sufferings of Central Europe, the Allied and Associated Governments have proposed such terms as no nation would accept otherwise than under duress, or with any intention of keeping them a day longer than such duress can be maintained.

For each detail of the proposals taken separately it may be possible to make out some colourable case, but taken as a whole they belie the spirit of the fourteen points and thus in substance constitute a breach of faith with a beaten enemy. They reduce Germany to the position of a helot nation, and thereby impose forces to hold her people down. The League of Nations is transformed into an alliance to secure this end, and if the terms are accepted the future policy of Europe must be more than ever based on force.

As Alsace-Lorraine kept Europe in ferment for forty years, so must the Saar basin and a separated East Prussia poison international relations in the future. The indemnity of £5,000,000,000 definitely demanded, still more the undefined

claims in the background, reduce Germany, if they are taken seriously, to economic servitude, while if it is intended that such claims shall be nugatory because impossible to execute, this very fact makes them a means of constantly imposing fresh political burdens upon a beaten people.

We do not know whether by the omission of some of these points it would be possible to transform the proposed terms into a practicable basis of permanent peace. It is, we fear, their whole spirit rather than specific details that is at fault. At any rate, of the Draft Treaty as it stands it may be predicted with certainty that it will have no endurance; that it will give the impression of having been inspired by vindictiveness and fear; that on such a basis it is impossible to establish any true League of Nations; but that it can only initiate a new epoch of mutual aggression and suspicion, with the inevitable consequences of increased armaments, permanent and universal conscription, and the perpetual danger of war.—Yours, etc.,

C. OXON.

C. BAILEY, Fellow of Balliol College, Oxford.

J. BELL, Fellow of Queen's College, Oxford.

HENRY BENTINCK, M.P.

ALICE M. BRUCE, Vice Principal and Tutor of Somerville College.

E. A. BURROUGHS, Fellow and Tutor of Hertford College, Canon of Peterborough.

J. ESTLIN CARPENTER, D.Litt., D.D.

E. I. CARLYLE, Fellow and Tutor of Lincoln College.

THEODORE CHAUNDY, Student and Tutor of Christ Church College, Oxford.

J. D. DENNISON H. ELLOW, Fellow and Tutor of Hertford College.

VERA FARNELL, Librarian, Somerville College.

W. H. FYFE, Fellow and Tutor of Merton College.

H. W. GARROD, Fellow and Tutor of Merton College.

C. BUCHANAN GREY, D.Litt., D.D.

A. B. GILLET.

C. B. HEBERDEN, D.C.L., Principal of Brasenose College, Oxford.

ARTHUR HENDERSON.

L. T. HOBHOUSE, Professor of Sociology at London University.

JULIAN S. HUXLEY, Senior Demonstrator, Department of Comparative Anatomy.

L. P. JACKS, LL.D., Principal of Manchester College, Oxford.

JEROME K. JEROME.

K. LEYS, Fellow of University College, Oxford.

J. M. KENWORTHY, M.P.

A. D. LINDSAY, Balliol College, Oxford.

WALTER LOCK, D.D., Warden of Keble College, Oxford.

WALTER H. MABERLEY, Fellow and Dean of Lincoln College

J. J. MALLON.

JOHN MASEFIELD.

GILBERT MURRAY, Regius Professor of Greek of Oxford University.

A. R. ORAGE, Editor of the "New Age."

A. E. J. RAWLINSON, M.A., Student and Tutor of Christ Church, Oxford.

W. B. SELBIE, D.D., Principal of Mansfield College, Oxford.

E. DE SELINCOURT, Professor of English Literature at Birmingham University

NORMAN H. SMITH, Mansfield College, Oxford.

F. C. SNOW, St. John's College, Oxford.

J. L. STOCKS, Fellow and Tutor of St. John's College.

BEATRICE STONEDALE, Bursar, Somerville College.

R. H. TAWNEY, Fellow of Balliol College.

H. G. WELLS.

LEONARD S. WOOLF.

VI. PRESIDENT WILSON'S FOURTEEN POINTS.

1. Open covenants of peace, openly arrived at, after which there shall be no private international understandings of any kind but diplomacy shall proceed always frankly and in the public view.

2. Absolute freedom of navigation upon the seas, outside territorial waters, alike in peace and in war, except as the seas may be closed in whole or in part by international action for the enforcement of international covenants.

3. The removal, so far as possible, of all economic barriers and the establishment of an equality of trade conditions among all the nations consenting to the peace and associating themselves for its maintenance.

4. Adequate guarantees given and taken that national armaments will be reduced to the lowest points consistent with domestic safety.

5. A free, open-minded and absolutely impartial adjustment of all colonial claims, based upon a strict observance of the principle that in determining all such questions of sovereignty the interests of the populations concerned must have equal weight with the equitable claims of the government whose title is to be determined.

6. The evacuation of all Russian territory and such a settlement of all questions affecting Russia as will secure the best and freest co-operation of the other nations of the world in obtaining for her an unhampered and unembarrassed opportunity for the independent determination of her own political development and national policy and assure her of a sincere welcome into the society of free nations under institutions of her own choosing; and, more than a welcome, assistance also of every kind that she may need and may herself desire. The treatment accorded Russia by her sister nations in the months to come will be the acid test of their good will, of their comprehension of her needs as distinguished from their own interests, and of their intelligent and unselfish sympathy.

7. Belgium, the whole world will agree, must be evacuated and restored, without any attempt to limit the sovereignty which she enjoys in common with all other free nations. No other single act will serve as this will serve to restore confidence among the nations in the laws which they have themselves set and determined for the government of their relations with one another. Without this healing act the whole structure and validity of international law is forever impaired.

8. All French territory should be freed and the invaded portions restored, and the wrong done to France by Prussia in 1871 in the matter of Alsace-Lorraine, which has unsettled the peace of the world for nearly fifty years, should be righted, in order that peace may once more be made secure in the interest of all.

9. A readjustment of the frontiers of Italy should be effected along clearly recognizable lines of nationality.

10. The peoples of Austria-Hungary, whose place among the nations we wish to see safeguarded and assured, should be accorded the freest opportunity of autonomous development.

11. Roumania, Serbia and Montenegro should be evacuated; occupied territories restored; Serbia accorded free and secure access to the sea, and the relations of the several Balkan states to one another determined by friendly counsel along historically established lines of allegiance and nationality; and international guarantees of the political and economic independence and territorial integrity of the several Balkan states should be entered into.

12. The Turkish portions of the present Ottoman Empire should be assured a secure sovereignty, but the other nationalities which are now under Turkish rule should be assured an undoubted security of life and an absolutely unmolested opportunity of autonomous development, and the Dardanelles should be permanently opened as a free passage to the ships and commerce of all nations under international guarantees.

13. An independent Polish state should be erected, which should include the territories inhabited by indisputably Polish populations, which should be assured a free and secure access to the sea, and whose political and economic independence and territorial integrity should be guaranteed by international covenant.

14. A general association of nations must be formed under specific covenants for the purpose of affording mutual guarantees of political independence and territorial integrity to great and small states alike.

THE FIVE POINTS

Laid down by President Wilson in his speech of Sept. 27, 1918, these being the points referred to in the armistice negotiations as "The President's subsequent utterances."

First, the impartial justice meted out must involve no discrimination between those to whom we wish to be just and those to whom we do not wish to be just. It must be a justice that plays no favourites and knows no standard but the equal rights of the several peoples concerned.

Second, no special or separate interest of any single nation or any group of nations can be made the basis of any part of the settlement which is not consistent with the common interest of all.

Third, there can be no leagues or alliances or special covenants and understandings within the general and common family of the League of Nations.

Fourth, and more specifically, there can be no special, selfish economic combinations within the League and no employment of any form of economic boycott or exclusion except as the power of economic penalty by exclusion from the markets of the world may be vested in the League of Nations itself as a means of discipline and control.

Fifth, all international agreements and treaties of every kind must be made known in their entirety to the rest of the world.

VII. MEMORANDUM OF ALLIED GOVERNMENTS

Transmitted through President Wilson to the German Government on
November 5, 1918.

The Allied Governments have given careful consideration to the correspondence which has passed between the President of the United States and the German Government. Subject to the qualifications which follow, they declare their willingness to make peace with the Government of Germany on the terms of peace laid down in the President's address to Congress of January 8, 1918, and the principles of settlement enunciated in his subsequent addresses.

They must point out, however, that Clause 2, relating to what is usually described as the freedom of the seas, is open to various interpretations, some of which they could not accept.

They must, therefore, reserve to themselves complete freedom on this subject when they enter the Peace Conference.

Further, in the conditions of peace laid down in his address to Congress of January 8, 1918, the President declared that the invaded territories must be restored, as well as evacuated and freed. The Allied Governments feel that no doubt ought to be allowed to exist as to what this provision implies. By it they understand that compensation will be made by Germany for all damage done to the civilian population of the Allies and their property by the aggression of Germany by land, by sea, and from the air.

INDEX.

	Page		Page
Allied Memorandum on War Aims	42	Garvin, Mr. J. L.	55
Allies' Memorandum to German Government	15, 87 (text)	General Confederation of Labour	7, 11, 32, 39, 46, 53, 55
Alsace-Lorraine	42, 73	General Confederation of Labour and German Colonies	46
Asquith, Mr.	46	German-Austria	45, 65
Balance of Power	9, 10	" " Amsterdam International on	45
Bela Kun	57	" " National Executive of the Labour Party on	45
Belgian Labour Party	32, 44, 53	German Counter Proposals (text)	70-9
Belgian Labour Party on German Colonies	46	German Independent Socialist Party	18
Belgian Labour Party on Malmedy and Eupen	45	German Labour, Declarations of	17, 18
Belgium	68	" Militarism	14
Berne Conference	22, 41-2	" Social Democratic Party	17
Blockade	69	Germany's Economic Position	35-6
Boer War	32	Guarantees	50-2
Bolsheviks	56-7-8, 60-1, 63	" German Proposals	78
Boundaries of Germany and German-Austria	41	Haig, Earl	54
Brailsford, H. N.	10	Hard, Mr. Wm.	61
Brest-Litovsk and Versailles	19, 20	Hoover, Mr.	41
British Labour Party	5	Indemnity	19, 31, 32, 41
British Labour Party on German Colonies	46	" German Proposals	76
British University Men, Protest by	84-5	India	67
Bullitt's, Mr. Wm. C., resignation	58, 83 (text of Letter)	Inter-Allied Conference on War Aims (1917)	38
China	48	Inter-Allied Labour and Socialist Conference (1915)	16, 28
Chinese National Defence League	49	Inter-Allied Labour Conference (February, 1918)	15, 16
Churchill, Mr. Winston	34, 56-7	Internal Navigation in Germany	77
Clemenceau, M.	9, 37	International Labour Legislation, Labour Party Memorandum on	25, 26, 27
Colonies	46, 66, 74	Ireland	67
Counter Proposals, German (text)	70-9	Italian Declaration	7
Credit	65	Italian Socialists and Russia	56
Cyprus	67	Japanese Imperialism in China	48
Czecho-Slovakia	42, 65	Kiao-chow	49
" Daily Mail "	54	Kiel Canal, German Proposals	77
Danube	33	Koltchak	56, 61-3
Danzig	42, 43, 44, 66, 71, 74	" " Supreme Ruler "	62
Disarmament	50-2, 66	K nigsberg	74
East Prussia	44, 66	Labour, German Proposals	78
Economic Clauses of Treaty	32	Labour Party, Annual Conference (1916)	8
" Imperialism	34-5	Labour Party, Annual Conference (1919)	20
" War	32	Labour's Demands	12, 13
Egypt	67	" Pledges	1-8
Enemy Property	20	Lahti	61
Eupen	45, 71		
Famine, Labour's Concern in	40		
Foch, General	54		
French Declaration	7		
French General Confederation of Labour	7, 11, 32, 39, 46, 53, 55		
French Revolution	63-4		

	Page
Laissez-faire	38
Law, Mr. Bonar	54
League of Nations	14, 20-7, 64
" " Clemenceau on	9
" " German Pro- posals	72
" " Labour Com- mission of	65
" " Proposed consti- tutional revision of	66
" " Representative Principles in	23
Lenin	58-9, 61
Lloyd George, Mr.	58
Malmédy	45, 71
" Manchester Guardian " and Russia	58
Mannerheim	61
Meiske, Mr.	63
Memel	71, 74
Memorandum (Allied) to German Government	15, 87
Memorandum on War Aims	9, 22, 34
" " " and German Colonies	47
Militarist Activity among Allies	51-3
Moresnet	71
National Executive of Labour Party	7, 53
National Executive of Labour Party and Parliamentary Labour Party, Joint Mani- festo	6, 21, 53
" Nationalisation of Women "	60
" New Republic "	11, 60, 62
" New Statesman "	60, 61
Occupation of Rhineland	51
Occupied Territory	20
Omsk, " White Terror " at	63
" Open Covenants "	8, 13, 14
Parliamentary Committee of Trades Union Congress	5
Permanent Commission of Labour and Socialist International	22, 43
" Petit Parisien "	61
Pichon, M.	59
Plebiscite, Upper Silesia	44-5
Poland	10, 43
Prinkipo	59
Private Rights	20
Ransome, Mr. Arthur	58-9
Rantzau's (Count) Statement	68
Raw Materials	13, 14, 36, 65
Raw Material, Germany's need of	36
Red Guards	61
Reparation and Restitution	31

	Page
Reparation and Restitution, Ar- rangements for	65
Reparation and Restitution, Ger- man Proposals	75-6
Responsibility and Punishment	28-30
Revision of Treaties	65-67
Rhineland, Occupation of	50-1
Rhine, Left Bank of	66
Rhine Republic Movement	51
Rosett, Dr. Joshua	62
Russia	55-63
Russian Constituent Assembly	62
Russia, Summary of Position of	67
Saar Valley	37, 42, 43, 65, 70, 73
Sarajevo Murders	24
Sarolea, Dr. Charles	83
" Save the Children Fund "	40
Sazonoff	60
Schleswig	70
Self-determination	14
Shantung	48, 66
Silesia	44, 66, 71, 73
Smuts, General, Protests by	80, 81
Southport Conference	6, 40, 55
Soviet Government	11, 58-9
" " Allies offer to	59-60
Soviet Marriage Law	60
Summarisation	64
Synopsis of Chapters	3-4
Tanner, Judge	61
" Times "	9, 56, 58
Trades Union Congress and Labour Party	23
Trades Union Congress, Parlia- mentary Committee of	5
Treaty and Labour in Germany	17, 18, 19
Trotsky	61
Tyrol	65
University Men, Protest by	84-5
Upper Silesia	44
Versailles and Brest-Litovsk	19, 20
West Prussia	43-4, 66
White Guards	60-1
" White Terror " in Russia and Finland	60-1
Wilson, President	8, 12, 15, 16, 17, 29, 38
" on Responsibility and Punishment	29
" Declarations	16, 17, 38
" Five Points	15, 86-7 (text)
" Fourteen Points	15, 38, 85 (text)
Wood, General Leonard	54
World Economic Council	39
Young, Mr. Douglas	58

THE WORK OF THE LABOUR RESEARCH DEPARTMENT.

THE work of the Research Department can be roughly classified under two main heads: that of collecting information and documents bearing on questions of interest to the Labour Movement, and that of rendering the information thus collected generally accessible.

PRESS-CUTTINGS SECTION and LABOUR NEWS SERVICE.

¶ All the leading newspapers and Labour papers, many local papers and journals of employers' associations are cut and filed for reference in the Department. From this source comes a large amount of the material which the Department, in conjunction with the Publicity Department of the Labour Party, is using as a basis for the Labour News Service, political and industrial.

LIBRARY OF LABOUR DOCUMENTS.

¶ The Department has a very large collection of Trade Union, Co-operative, Socialist, and other Labour documents, and also of Government Reports and White Papers dealing with matters of interest to Labour, including Education, Local Government, Public Health and Insurance, Trade Unionism and all questions relating to Trade Unions, legal questions affecting Labour, after-war problems, and a large number of others. All documents are filed and indexed, and the information derived from them is available for consultation by members and affiliated societies.

INTERNATIONAL SECTION.

¶ A collection of foreign labour documents has now been accumulated, and an international section has been set up. The information is published through the Monthly Circular, and communications are being established with Labour abroad in various countries.

LOCAL CORRESPONDENTS.

¶ The Department has secured the services of a number of local correspondents and investigators who report upon the state of industrial and political organisation in various districts. This also enables special investigations to be undertaken on points of particular interest; and it is hoped to develop this branch of the work very considerably in the near future.

COMMITTEES OF INQUIRY.

¶ Committees of Inquiry are set up to investigate any subject of particular importance, and the Reports of these Committees are published in due course. Subjects already dealt with include the Co-operative Movement, Co-operative Production, the Organisation of Teachers and Other Professionals, Industrial Assurance, and the working of the Health Insurance Act, and proposals for an international authority; and Committees are at present at work on the history, organisation,

15363-15



OCT 20 1986

DATE DUE

University of California
SOUTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY FACILITY
405 Hilgard Avenue, Los Angeles, CA 90024-1388
Return this material to the library
from which it was borrowed.

REC'D LD-URL

~~NOV 14 1997~~ OCT 6 1997



UC SOUTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY FACILITY

A 000 631 023 9

